THE

AMERICAN

BC

CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

REVIEW.

Bonum est homini ut eum veritas volentem, quia malum est homini ut eum veritas vincat invitum. Nam ipsa vincat necesse est, sive negantum sive confitentum.

S. AUG. EPIST. CCXXXVIII. AD PASCENT.

VOLUME VIII.

FROM JANUARY to OCTOBER, 1883.

PHILADELPHIA:
HARDY & MAHONY,
PUBLISHERS AND PROPRIETORS,
505 CHESTNUT STREET.

COPYRIGHT, 1883,

BY

HARDY & MAHONY.

70141

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PAGE

SOCIAL AND MORAL ASPECTS OF ITALY AND OTHER CATHOLIC COUNTRIES, 1

Political confusion of the countries of Southern Europe, 1; Relations of moral conduct to the teachings of faith, 2; Apostasy and infidelity in Catholic countries, 3; Incoherent character of Protestantism, 4; To what the present disorder in Italy is due, 5; The natural fruits of Protestantism, 7; Disintegrating nature of the doctrine of private judgment, 9; Why many non-Catholics are better than their religious principles, 10; The Church's resources for the bettering of men, 11; Political condition in Italy to be considered, 13; Religio-political principles of the Emperor Joseph II., 14; Jansenism at the Italian courts, 15; Unchristian conduct of Catholic kings towards the Holy See, 16; Civil allegiance and submission to ecclesiastical authority, 17; Protestantism and political absolutism, 18; Influence of the French Revolution on Italy, 19; The teaching of the schools and the practical issues of life, 20; Napoleon's school system in Italy, 21; Dissertation on political and civil liberty, 22; Alliances after Napoleon's fall, 24; Condition of Christendom at that time, 25; Papal policy of Gregory XVI. and Pius IX., 26; The Italian Revolution of 1848, 27; Christianity losing its hold on European statesmanship, 28; New auxiliaries of the old enemies of the Church, 29; Conduct of King Victor Emmanuel II., 30; The events of 1859, 31; Garibaldi as an ally of the powers against the Pope, 32; Neither right nor justice in the foundation and construction of United Italy, 34; How the Pope stands towards the Italian Government, 36; Striking apathy of Catholic peoples in the present crisis, 37; The Pope and his temporal subjects, 38; The gross political outrage and national plunder of 1870, 40; What the Church has suffered since then, 41; Note on religion in other countries than Italy, 42.

THE INFLUENCE OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI ON MEDIÆVAL ART. By *Arthur Waldon*, ... 43

The new departure made by St. Francis, 43; Asceticism and sympathy with nature his two great traits, 44; Sin and its consequences in man, 45; Connection between true art and religion, 46; A greater influence than brush, chisel, or mere skill, 47; Simplicity in the Franciscan habitations, 48; How much of a poet was St. Francis, 49; Wonderful effects of his sanctity, 51; His spirit perpetuated by his multitudes of disciples, 52; Beginning and progress of the mystic school of art, 53; Cimabue, Giotto, and other masters, 54; Where Fra Angelico got his inspiration, 55; What our Saint did for architecture, 57; What the love of God in a single individual is able to effect, 58.

FREQUENT COMMUNION. By *Right Rev. Thomas A. Becker, D.D.*, . . . 59

The Society of Jesus and the spirit of the Church, 59; The chief means by which salvation is attained, 60; Advantages of study now within the reach of both seminarian and priest, 61; Great merits of a little treatise by Father Cros, S.J., 62; The Calvinistic and the Catholic methods of treating the sinner, 63; Charges proved against the Jansenists—How to prepare children for first communion, 64; As you bend the twig you bend the tree, 65; How to approach holy communion, 66.

THE IRISH SITUATION. By *Thomas Power O'Connor, M.P.*, ... 68

Position of the Gladstone cabinet when the new rules of procedure were adopted, 68; Party majority and retention of office, 69; How friends and foes feel towards Mr. Gladstone, 70; His administration having the appearance of great strength, 72; Obstruction before and after the new rules were adopted, 73; Loss of control in the House of Commons by the Irish party, 74; Position of the Government in Ireland, 75; A lull among the Irish people themselves, 76; The process of material decay going on all over Ireland, 78; What ought to be done in the circumstances, 79; The "No-rent" question discussed, 80; Other questions of policy than the land question, 81; Disgraceful state of the franchise in Ireland, 82; Political influence in local boards, 83; Sources of strength to the popular forces, 84; A period of thorough organization needed, 85; Position and prospects of the Irish Parliamentary party, 86; The dangers ahead and how to meet them, 87.

CHURCH ARCHITECTURE IN THE UNITED STATES. By *Joseph A. Nolan, Ph.D.*, ... 88

Meaning, scope, and character of architecture, 88; Good architecture and the speedy increase of churches, 89; The great evil of the country is hurry, 90; Various kinds of economy in architecture, 91; Architectural absurdities and shams in the shape of churches, 92; Errors pointed out in detail, 93; Ginger-bread work inside

PAGE

and out, 94; Faults in altars, 95; Mural decorations, Church paintings, etc., 96; Faults in other details of furnishing and design, 98; Honest work more needed than ornament, 99; Circumstances under which churches are built here, 100; Remedy for the prevailing faults and needs, 101; Religious art, like other arts, is in decay, 102.

RELIGION AND LIFE. By *A. de G.*, ... 103

Decline of religion as a dogmatic belief, 103; Conflict of knowledge with intensity of religious belief, 104; The tendency of our age is to take practical views of all things, 105; What life when applied to man comprises, 106; Periods in life as well as in development, 107; Christianity a true and perfect religion, 108; How the civilized world became Christian, 110; Christian theology and philosophy, 111; The adequacy of true religion to cope with life's fulness, 112; In what the main office of religion consists, 114; Man as a being whose aspirations rest in the infinite, 115; What has become of religion outside the Church, 116; Religion has variable as well as constant elements, 117; Philosophical training an indispensable requisite for applying religion to life, 119.

THE PUBLIC PRESS AND PUBLIC MORALS. By *John MacCarthy*, . . 120

Non-Catholics accuse the Church of ignorance, 120; Systematic misrepresentation, 121; Hostility of governments to the Church, 122; Why and how the press is in opposition, 123; Mr. Gladstone's religio-political pamphlets, 124; The public press as apart from any question of creed, 125; Its friends' defence of its conduct, 126; How public journals are encouragers and propagators of vice, 127; In what sense they are right, 129; Paganism in our popular literature, 130; Press censorship in countries professing freedom, 131; The press as a representative of the commonwealth, 133; Influence of the anti-Christian spirit in newspapers, 134; The question of a Catholic daily newspaper in America, 135; Discussing Catholic questions in non-Catholic journals, 136; Support of the Catholic press, 137.

THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY, AND CIVIL LAWS FOR ITS ENFORCEMENT. By *John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.*, ... 139

What the Christian Sunday really is, 139; Christian practice in the early days of the Church, 141; Characteristics of the Christians' day of rest, 142; How it became necessary to find authority for the observance of Sunday, 143; The Puritans and their Sabbath, 144; Sunday laws in the British Colonies in America, 145; Associations for strict observance, 146; Servile labor and the Sunday, 148; Catholics and the observance of Sunday, 149; The separation of Church and State in our republic, 150; Object of the earlier American law, 151; How Sunday stands before the law, 152.

IS SPIRITISM A DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY? By *Rev. J. F. X. Hœffer*, ... 153

Upon what the claims of Spiritism are based, 153; Fundamental truths concerning miracles and marvels, 154; Discriminating from among wonderful effects those that come from God, 155; Differences between miracles and marvels, 157; Spiritists pervert the definition and philosophy of miracles, 158; Essential differences that distinguish true from false miracles, 160; Miracles ignored or misrepresented by Spiritists, 162; Ends and purposes of the miracles of Christ, 163; What the whole argument of Spiritists comes to, 165; What Spiritists claim to do as to prophecies, 166; Real nature, claims, and promises of Spiritism, 167; Its triumphs are the victories of the powers of darkness, 168; Spiritism pretends to enhance Christ's moral teaching, 169; Immorality of Spiritism best known in America, 170; Effect of Spiritism on man's social condition, 171; Its boast of scientific revelations, 172; Spiritist revelations only hinted at, 173; Where Spiritism is striving to place mankind, 174; Spiritism and Antichrist, 175.

A LIMIT TO EVOLUTION. By *Prof. St. George Mivart, F.R.S., etc.*, . . 193

Evolution in its familiar sense, 193; Its etymological meaning, 194; Three limits to evolution, 195; First things to be examined in this investigation, 197; Powers of retention and association of feelings, 198; Two feelings of constant occurrence and great significance, 199; Association of the different kinds of feelings, 201; Tendency to imitation,—means and ends, 203; Intellectual side of our nature, 204; Interpreting the signs given by external objects, 205; Two distinct elements in every intellectual perception, 207; The power of mental abstraction described, 208; Bearing of certain facts on the doctrine of evolution, 210; Abstraction as universal as language, 212; Language, thought, and abstract ideas, 213; Four rules which should be borne carefully in mind, 215; Goodness as marking a distinction in mental acts, 217; The difference that separates men from all brutes, 218; A nature higher even than man's, 220; The Darwinian view of man's origin due to want of knowledge, 221.

SOCIALISM. By *Right Rev. James O'Connor, D.D.*, ... 222

Socialism in its two-fold bearing of Communism and co-operation, 222; History of Communistic communities, 223; The fundamental error of Socialism, 224; The right to have and to hold and dispose of a thing as one's own, 225; The early organization of society, 226; Community of goods a thing not evil in itself, 227; When

PAGE

it is wrong, 228; The danger of unfaithful stewardship, 229; Communism, even if forced on a nation, could not last, 230; How the rights of property have varied, 231; The chief claim put forward by Communists, 233; Poverty is but a temporal evil, 234; Other evils charged against the present order of things, 235; Productive resources of association, etc., 236; Absurdity of central direction of a country's industries, 237; Co-operation as a variety of Socialism, 238; Under what circumstances combinations of workmen are allowable, 240; Dangers to be apprehended from Communism in the United States, 241.

THE CHAPELLE DES MARTYRS AND THE SEPTEMBER MASSACRE; A RELIC OF THE REVOLUTION, ... 243

Historical service of ancient buildings, 243; The "Carmes" becomes a prison in the French Revolution, 244; History of the Convent, 245; Suppression of the Religious, 246; Arrests of priests in 1792, 247; How the massacre of September 2d was brought about, 248; The prisoners before the attack, 250; Getting rid of them, 251; The slaughter at the Abbaye, 252; Carnage at the Carmes, 253; Incidents of the massacre, 254; Preparing for the burial, 256; Reminiscences of escaped prisoners, 257; A remarkable story, 259; Parallel between 1792 and 1871, 260; Slaughter of Mgr. Darboy and his companions, 261; Drawing the moral, 263.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND POPULAR EDUCATION. By *William J. Onahan*, ... 264

The Church faithful to the traditions of her past, 264; How shallow and unsubstantial are the charges against her, 265; Christian schools in the early ages, 266; The Popes the great founders of schools, 267; Education under the Carlovingians, 268; Testimony of Mosheim and other Protestant writers, 269; The great schools of the later middle ages, 270; Origin of the famous English universities, 271; A glorious period of Irish history, 273; The first printers assisted by the Popes, 275; How ancient learning has been preserved and political liberty achieved, 276; Two more Protestant writers on the monks, 277; Public libraries in the olden times, 278; Mediæval works in modern libraries, 279; Self-devotedness of the teaching religious orders, 280; The Catholic Church always the foster-mother of education, 281.

HOW CHURCH HISTORY IS WRITTEN. By *Very Rev. James A. Corcoran, D.D.*, ... 282

The modern fashion of writing Church History, 282; Unity of the Church proven from the New Testament, 283; Protestant historians of to-day make Christianity absurd, 284; They are not only unjust but blasphemous, 285; Incongruous character of Dr. Schaff's Church History, 286; Anti-Catholic bias makes him stoop to petty artifices, 287; His erroneous idea of a truly Christian spirit, 288; The Church historian and Christ's earthly kingdom, 289; The question of the inspiration of the books of the Old and the New Testament, 290; Man as the channel of communication between God and man, 291; Dr. Schaff on St. James, the Council of Jerusalem, St. John, 292; St. Peter, St. Luke, 293; His virulent attacks on everything Catholic, 294; He is only a bitter, unscrupulous partisan, 295.

THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY IN ITS THREEFOLD SOURCE. By *John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.*, ... 296

The three original American Sees, 296; Early missionaries in the territory now known as the United States, 297; Three biographies that typify the three sources of our hierarchy, 298; Life of the first Bishop of Mexico, Zumárraga, 299; Condition of Mexico in his time, 301; His efforts in behalf of the Indians, 302; He performs the first act of Episcopal consecration on our continent, 303; Position as to income and residence, 304; Increase of dioceses—His last public act as mere bishop, 305; He is made archbishop but soon dies, 306; Early missions in Canada—Quebec made an episcopal see, 307; The first bishop, Laval, and his first Vicar-General, 308; Progress of the Church in New France, 309; What Bishop St. Vallier did for his diocese, 310; The Church in the English colonies, especially in Maryland, 311; Clinging to the faith under persecution, 312; The see of Philadelphia, 312; Sketch of Bishop Neumann, 313; Archbishop Kenrick's relations with him, 314; He gets the late Archbishop Wood as coadjutor and dies soon after, 315; The three types of American Bishops, Zumárraga, St. Vallier, and Neumann, 316.

JASPER IN THE APOCALYPSE THE SYMBOL OF THE PRIMACY. By *Rev. Walter D. Strappini, S.J.*, ... 316

St. John conveys his meaning to us in symbolism, 316; The picture in the Apocalypse of the Celestial City, 317; His mention of jasper must have reference to some part of the Church, 318; The properties of jasper as the groundwork of its symbolism, 319; The twelve foundation stones typify the twelve Apostles, 320; Simon Peter singled out as the stone par excellence, 321; His primacy and the jasper symbol, 322; St. John's imagery corresponds with Catholic doctrine, 324; Answering objections to the theory here advanced, 325.

LAWLESSNESS AND LAW IN IRELAND. By *Bryan J. Clinche*, ... 326

A people not necessarily lawless because it resists unjust law, 326; The astounding slowness of legislative reforms in Ireland, 327; Evils of this slowness aggravated by preceding systems, 328; The Executive in Ireland inevitably despotic, 329;

PAGE

How and by whom the law is administered, 330; The law courts the mere tools of despotism, 331; Legal patronage vested in the judges, 332; Proportion of the judges to the membership of the Irish bar, 333; How the law is administered in smaller matters, 334; Ascendency of the class called "respectable," 335; Arbitrary rulings of the local magistrates, 336; The "stipendiaries," 337; The jury system perhaps the most disgraceful of all, 338; The people think law and justice naturally opposed to each other, 340; Practical difficulties of "packing," 341; No wonder the people regard law in Ireland with distrust, 342.

MR. MOZLEY'S REMINISCENCES OF THE OXFORD MOVEMENT. By *John Charles Earle, B.A. Oxon.*, ... 342

The interest felt in Mr. Mozley's volumes, 342; The reviewer's personal reminiscences, 343; Memories of Newman, 344; His early education, 345; His debut in the character of a parson, 347; His early contemporaries, 348; Newman the chief figure in Mozley's book, 350; Gallery of Oxford portraits, 351; Mr. Mozley is a veritable Boswell, 352; Henry Wilberforce and Newman, 353; Mozley's interest in the Catholic religion, 354; Not using time as directed, 355; The most frequent and cherished subject of religious meditation, 357; Anecdotes of Newman in his Oxford days, 359; Dr. Pusey and James Anthony Froude in the Oxford movement, 360; Mr. Mozley on the late Dr. Ward, 361; How little he has to say of Dr. Pusey, 363.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF MARRIAGE. By *Rev. Henry A. Bran, D.D.*, . 385

Mormon polygamy in the United States, 385; The polygamy permitted by divorce, 386; Pope Leo XIII. on divorce, 387; Contrast of Protestant with Catholic views, 388; Catholic teaching on the chief points of marriage, 389; The obscure should always be explained by the clear, 391; Bad effect of remarriage after divorce even for adultery, 392; The Catholic interpretation of Scripture texts, 394; Why the Anglican Church permits divorce for adultery, 396; Causes of divorce in various States of the Union, 397; Illogical position in regard to impediments, 399; Why the Catholic Church claims exclusive control over marriage, 400; Some of the annulling impediments, 401; Whether there can be any departure from the general law of impediments, 402; The power of annulling and dispensing in marriage, 403.

THE CHURCH OF FRANCE AND THE REVOLUTION. By *Kathleen O'Meara*, . 404

The Pope and the Powers, 404; The Revolution undertaking to decatholicize France, 405; The Jansenists blind to the consequences of their principles, 406; How the "Civil Constitution of the Clergy" was brought about, 407; The clergy directly attacked by the Revolution, 408; Talleyrand's anomalous position, 409; The Ecclesiastical Committee pushing its work, 410; Trying to arrest the conflagration by the "Civil Constitution," 411; Falsely charging the evil to the Bull *Unigenitus*, 412; Manly but hopeless fight of the Church's champions, 414; A condemnation from Rome that came too late, 415; The "Civil Constitution" gets the royal signature, 416; One brave champion of the Church, 417; The clergy taking the civil oath, 418; Consecrating the new bishops, 419; The people fighting shy of the new pastors, 420; Confusion and disappointment increased by the Papal Brief, 421; One of Louis XVI.'s last acts of prerogative, 422; The massacres of September, 1792, general persecution of the clergy, 424; Conduct of the "Constitutional" contrasted with that of the faithful clergy, 425; "Constitutional" bishops publicly abjuring Christianity, 426; Revolutionary revelry at its height, 427; How the temporary triumph of the Church's enemies was ended, 428; History of the Concordat with Napoleon, 429; Duplicity of the great soldier, 430; The organic articles, 431; Napoleon's coronation, 433; How Pius VII. became Napoleon's prisoner, 434; The Emperor's struggle with the Holy See involving him in difficulties, 435; Napoleon filling his cup of iniquities towards the Church, 436; Pius VII. carried to Fontainebleau, 438; Napoleon at last checkmated, 439; His fall and the Pope's restoration, 440; The irony of fate, 441.

AN OLD BIBLICAL PROBLEM SOLVED AT LAST. By *Rev. Simon Lebl, D.D.*, 442

A most important work on Biblical science, 442; Existence of Hebrew metre, 443; This highly probable *d priori*, 444; Also by the nature of Biblical poetry, 447; Existence of Hebrew metres historically certain, 449; Some weighty evidence adduced, 452; St. Jerome on the subject, 454; The latest trace of the knowledge, 457; A very good touchstone of metrical systems, 459; Explanation ventured by Jebb, 460; Satisfactory character of Bickell's proof, 462.

FATHER FELIX VARELA, VICAR-GENERAL OF NEW YORK FROM 1837 TO 1853. By *J. I. Rodriguez*, ... 463

This sketch a tribute of gratitude, 463; Father Varela's early life, 464; In the Seminary, 465; Early renown in the priesthood, 466; As a philosopher, 467; As a patriot also, 468; Ferdinand VII. and Cuba, 469; Father Varela in the Spanish Congress, 470; Arrival in the United States and settlement in New York, 471; How usefully he spent his life here, 472; Strength of the Church at that time, 473; Father Varela as a Church builder, 474; His literary works, 475; Illness, death, and burial, 476.

PAGE

CAPITAL AND LABOR. By *Right Rev. James O'Connor, D.D.*, . . . 477

What the socialist would do with the capitalist, 477; Services rendered deserve compensation, 478; The rights of capital, 479; Corporations as business concerns, 480; They have the ordinary frailties of human nature, 481; But they are great conservative forces in society, 482; They should be dealt with in a friendly spirit, 483; Capital harder to command than either labor or superintendence, 484; Labor should always bring its natural price, 485; Boards of arbitration, 486; They have not done all they might do, 488; Another life better than the present, 489; Irreligion and false principles of economy, 490; Organization of arbitration boards, 491; Employers not always responsible for hardships, 492; The rights of strikers, 493; The aim of this essay, 494.

ENGLISH ADMINISTRATION IN IRELAND TO-DAY. By *Bryan J. Clinche*, . 495

Distinction between the government and the people in Ireland, 495; The powers devolving on the grand juries, 496; Their religious and political character, 497; How the poor and public hospitals are provided for, 498; Legal relief for destitute poor a modern feature, 499; Viciousness of the system of education, 500; Original object of the National system, 501; How slowly reforms take place in Ireland, 502; Irish public works as a sample of English administration, 503; The Board's action unchecked, 504; Dependence of the Irish people on government aid, 505; Administration of the Irish police, 506; The Boards are the real government of Ireland at present, 507; How eminently practical is the demand of the Irish for Home Rule, 508.

CONVERTS—THEIR INFLUENCE AND WORK IN THIS COUNTRY. By *John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.*, ... 509

The results of heresy are terrible, 509; Difficulties of conversion, 510; Conversions in this country from the settlement of Maryland, 511; The Church in colonial times, 512; Catholicity presented to the people of the United States, 513; How strangely grace triumphed in Mr. Thayer, 514; Other prominent converts of his time, 515; Mrs. Seton and others, 516; Converts from all forms of Protestantism, 517; A period of warm controversy, 518; Conversion of soldiers in the Mexican war, 519; A conversion showing ignorance among Protestants, 520; Strong minds breaking away from Congregationalism, 521; Fruits in this country of the English Tractarian movement, 522; The Mercersburg school, 523; Position and influence of neo-Catholics after their conversion, 523; Catholics and American national feelings, 525; Converts in the priesthood, 526; Dr Brownson and other convert editors, 527; The question of a great American Catholic University, 528.

THE ALLEGED FALL OF POPE LIBERIUS. By *Rev. P. J. Harrold*, . . 529

Unique character of this subject, 529; Calumnies of the Gallican party in France, 530; The Church and the Arian heresy, 531; Firmness of the See of Rome amid stormy scenes, 533; Tyranny of the Arian faction, 534; Examination of arguments used by those who regard Liberius as a heretic, 535; The famous "Fragmenta" of Hilary, 537; Weakness of the case against Liberius, 538; What would have taken place had he fallen, 541; Liberius and the Emperor, 542; What Theodoret says in his "Ecclesiastical History," 544; The "Fragmenta" again, 545; Interpolations in favor of the Arians, 546; Recapitulation, 547.

THE NEW SOVEREIGNTY. By *Arthur Featherstone Marshall, B.A. Oxon.*, . 549

In what sense the new sovereignty is a departure from the old, 549; Thinking and believing by logic, 550; On what the old sovereignty was founded, 551; The new sovereignty the conservation of the authority of private judgment, 553; Driving it to its ultimate possibilities, 554; The grandest fallacy the world has known, 555; Political consequences of the deification of self-worship, 556; What object modern Liberals try to gain and how they succeed, 557; The parliamentary oath in various countries, 559; Effect of the new sovereignty upon society, 560; The new sovereignty has corrupted civilization, 563.

THE LAW OF PRAYER. By *Most Rev. James Gibbons, D.D.*, ... 577

An unbeliever's objections to our holy religion, 577; The language of the heart has always been the same, 579; Analysis of our soul as to the intellect, the affections, and the will, 580; Whence these are to be supplied with the necessaries, 581; What is revealed to us in prayer and contemplation, 582; Communion with God gives us strength, 583; Some illustrious examples, 584; When our prayers are answered, 585; Prayer is the most exalted function in which man can engage, 587; Objections against prayer as to its relation with future events, 588; An example for scientists, 589; False basis of their objections, 590; Prayer does not encourage indolence, 591; God should be petitioned, 592; Supplication, and apparently unanswered petitions, 593; Prayers answered otherwise than asked for, 594; Conversions in answer to prayer, 595.

WILLIAM M. THACKERAY. By *A. J. Faust, Ph.D.*, ... 597

Have Dickens and Thackeray been excelled by more recent novelists, 597; Activity of thought when Thackeray appeared, 598; His circumstances and education, 599; What his school tastes were, 600; His habits of observation and reflection

PAGE

when a youth on the Continent, 601; The recent change in the popular estimate of Thackeray, 603; A moiety of what he did would have made his reputation, 605; His literary genius reactionary in form, 606; "Vanity Fair" ushered in a new school, 607; He was no flatterer of titled rank, 609; His highest point of artistic excellence, 610; The characters in "Esmond," 611; The word "realistic" as applied to his writings, 613; The story of his life, 614; Relations with Dickens and Yates, 615; Some of his satires, 616; Shorter sketches and "Barry Lyndon," 618; Curious parallel of "Vanity Fair," and "Pickwick," 619; How Thackeray set himself to repair his fortunes, 621; His great merit as a lecturer, 622; A funny Oxford incident, 623; A point as to Fielding, 624; Thackeray's brief career in politics, 625; His attitude towards the Catholic Church, 626.

THE CHURCH IN SPAIN. By *Rev. Bernard O'Reilly*, ... 627

Mistaken notion of the Church's influence in Southern Europe, 627; Conflicts of Spanish royalty with the Papacy, 628; The system of tyranny that began with Charles V., 629; Admissions of an author hostile to the Church, 630; Condition of things under Philip II., 632; How he killed the fowl that laid the golden eggs, 633; His financial extravagance ruined Spain, 634; Even the wealth of the Indies was of no avail, 635; The present impoverished condition of Spain easily accounted for, 636; True character of the Spanish Inquisition, 637; Lowest ebb of degradation reached, 638; Infamies and results of Napoleon's invasion, 639; The miserable pittances of the Spanish clergy, 640; The Voltairian philosophy in Spain, 641; Mistaken notion of non-Catholics on the relation of the temporal and spiritual powers, 642; How the Concordats enslaved the Church, 643; The Constitutions of 1869 and 1876, 645; The government intolerant of religious educators, 646; Social status of the Church in the Peninsula, 647; Mock show of concern by the persecutors, 648; The outlook before the Spanish clergy, 649.

WHO WROTE THE "IMITATION OF CHRIST"? By *Rev. Aug. J. Thebaud, S.J.*, 650

Importance and popularity of this little book, 650; Cause of the conflict of opinion regarding its authorship, 651; How the controversy began, 652; The personality of the supposed rival authors, 653; Intricacies of the controversy, 655; Opinion of Mabillon and other learned Benedictines, 656; The supposed early copies of the work, 657; The claims of Chancellor Gerson, 658; Thomas à Kempis and the Canons Regular of Windesheim, 659; Tell-tale allusions in the "Imitation," 661; Life of Thomas à Kempis, 662; The expressions in the book called Germanisms, 664; Proofs of its authorship from the Latin text, 665; Utter weakness of Gersen's claims, 666; The manuscripts of the work in existence, 667; Striking peculiarities of these manuscripts, 668; Antiquity of the manuscripts, 669; Nearly everybody now in favor of Thomas à Kempis, 671.

BANCROFT'S HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES. By *John Gilmary Shea, LL.D.*, ... 672

Our first great philosophic historian, 672; Character of his scholarship, 673; Changes in the first two volumes of his new edition, 674; Alterations in the early history of Maryland, 675; Gross injustice to Lord Baltimore, 676; Treatment of the Maryland settlement essentially unfair, 677; Opposite character of the changes as to New England, 678; Unpleasant deductions from Bancroft's theories, 679; British America under the last two Stuarts, 680; Intolerance as regarded by our author, 681; Extent of the changes now introduced, 682; Inconsistency the great defect of the work, 683; Treatment of the Indians, 684; Troubles between France and England at the close of the Colonial period, 685; How a union was first forced on the colonies, 686; Warnings to England by French statesmen, 687; General character of Bancroft's work, 688.

MARTIN LUTHER, ... 689

Luther not much of a boast for Protestantism, 689; The little now left of his system, 690; His early life, 691; Germany in his time, 692; Catholic principles had but a weak hold there, 693; The country and the time ripe for a pagan revival, 694; Beginning of Luther's rebellion, 695; His hypocrisy and violence of temper, 696; Contradictions in his ninety-five theses, 697; Luther and Leo X., 698; Queer doings for a man yet pretending to be a Catholic priest, 699; Cajetan's mission to Luther, 700; The farce renewed with Miltitz, 701; Luther first giving form to Protestantism, 702; Violence of his hatreds, 703; Terrible inroads of his innovations, 704; Condition of affairs when the Diet of Augsburg met, 705; Culmination of his power and influence, 706; What he says of his own marriage, 707; Luther's Bible his most potent work, 708; He paved the way for modern Rationalism, 709.

WHAT HAS IRELAND GAINED BY AGITATION? By *John Boyle O'Reilly*, . 710

Parnell's great and growing power, 710; Ireland's recent gain has been intellectual as well as material, 711; The five propositions underlying the new national League, 712; Reforms promised for next year and concessions lately made, 713; Three influences impeding the progress of the new League, 714; Elevation of tone in the Irish movement, 715; It goes on rapidly enough, 716.

THE ORIGIN OF CIVIL AUTHORITY. By *Rev. John Ming, S.J.*, . . . 716

The true idea of the origin of authority, 716; Its divine descent clearly knowable, 717; Authority implies command over our destiny, 718; It is competent to God alone, 719; How we may know His will in regard to society, 720; Why God created

PAGE

the universe, 721; Remarks on the eternal law, 722; The strength and properties that may be derived from superhuman principles, 723; St. Thomas on human enactments, 724; Conformity of human law with the moral order, 725; Law must be just and equitable, 726; When human laws have binding power, 727; The establishment of rights, 728; The civil authority with regard to them, 729; Right must be within the boundaries of morality, 730; A conclusion opposed to modern theories, 731; These considerations and the majesty of the State's authority, 732; Qualifications of those to be invested with authority, 733; The two ways in which God may communicate authority, 734; Influence of men in governments, 735; The teaching of Catholic authorities, 736; Are the people able to retain and to exercise power? 737; Government the primordial holder of supreme power, 738; The multitude acts as a secondary cause, 739; Advantages which authority has for rulers and subjects, 741; Temptations of the stability of power, 742; Dignity and rights of the people, 743; Means to prevent oppression, 744; The Catholic Church has always upheld the divine origin of civil power, 745.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF INTROSPECTION. By *A. de G.*, ... 746

The theory of change as applied to life, 746; Importance of the elements of life under consideration, 747; Conscience the most prominent element of religious feeling, 748; Insufficiency of the creeds in force before Christianity, 749; Character of the mediæval era, 750; In what the strongest evidence of Christianity lies, 751; Protestantism at best but Christianity on sufferance, 752; No wonder that it has produced infidelity, 753; Character of confession in the Catholic Church, 754; When confession would be ridiculous, 755; Prospect of Christianity's future, 756.

BOOK NOTICES.

PAGE

Alice Reardon, A Tale for the Young.... 384
Alternative (The), A Study in Psychology.... 568

Beauties of the Catholic Church.... 383
Beginnings of History (The).... 182
Bobbie and Birdie, A Story for Little Ones.... 384
Brownson (Orestes A.), Works of, 177, 378, 565

Catholic Boys' and Girls' Library.... 574
Catholic Pioneers of America.... 384
Catholic Prize Library.... 574
Catholic Reward Library, Two series.... 574
Christian Father (The).... 379
Conferences on the Blessed Trinity.... 192
Conferences for Married Men (Weninger), 573
Conferences for Married Women (Weninger).... 573

Eliane.... 384
English Grammars (Goold Brown's).... 192
English Literature and Literary Criticism.... 369

Golden Sands.... 576

History of the People of the United States (A).... 365
Holy Man of Tours (The).... 189

Illustrated Catholic Family Annual for 1884.... 768

Landmarks of English Literature.... 572
Leaves from the Annals of the Sisters of Mercy.... 762
Letters and Memorials of Cardinal Allen, 374
Life and Times of St. Anselm.... 377

PAGE

Life of Leon Papin Dupont.... 189
Life of Martin Luther. (Koestlin).... 764
Life of Martin Luther. (Stang).... 764
Life of St. Dominic.... 375
Life of St. Lewis Bertrand.... 191
Little Hinges to Great Doors.... 384
Mac Hale's (Archbishop) Sermons and Discourses.... 767
Man Before Metals.... 570
Mediæval Civilization.... 760

Natalie Narischkin.... 383
Newark Catechism (The).... 381

Outline of Irish History.... 575

Patron Saints.... 571
Pious Affections towards God and the Saints.... 768

Return of the King.... 575

Santa Teresa de Jesus.... 381
Science and Sentiment.... 382

Socrates, The Apology of, etc.... 372
Sodalist's Vade Mecum.... 383
St. Francis's Manual, for Members of the Third Order.... 380
Story of the Scottish Reformation.... 757
Study of Spinosa (A).... 382

The English Novel, etc.... 576
The Mystery Solved.... 192
True Servants of God.... 576
Typhoons of the Chinese Seas.... 187

Uncle Pat's Cabin.... 576

Works and Words of Our Saviour.... 192

THE AMERICAN CATHOLIC

QUARTERLY REVIEW.

VOL. VIII.—JANUARY, 1883.—No. 29.

SOCIAL AND MORAL ASPECT OF ITALY AND OTHER CATHOLIC COUNTRIES.

Laing's Notes of a Traveller.—Alison's History of Europe.

THE inter-social conditions of the nations of Southern Europe has been often referred to as one of the scandals of our age. Of late years Spain seems to have partly recovered from her former anarchy, and, in spite of the extravagance of political parties, to be seeking to find a basis for a conservative policy. France, owing to the excesses of a radical faction, is still deeply agitated, while Italy, under the leadership of base, anti-Christian statesmen, appears to be mad with a revolutionary frenzy. Explain this state of things to the world as best you may, there will still remain in the minds of many the latent thought that the Catholic Church is somehow to be held responsible for the political confusion and criminal record of those countries. This reflection, formed merely at first view, is rounded off by the study of the condition of England and Germany, two Protestant nations, at present among the most powerful of the nations of the world.

The fact itself, it must be admitted, is very striking, and, when not studied in relation to the great question which it covers, is apt to confuse minds, and beget prejudice. National wealth, indeed, and national grandeur, and high national intellectual culture, recommend themselves, as the world goes, to general esteem; but no one, surely, would take either of these, or all of them, to be a test of Christian truth or morality. Riches or national glory is not the measure of Christianity, nor is high mental training, as even experience shows, a fully reliable proof of moral goodness.

Pagan Rome and Greece, given up to lewdness and idolatry, attained to greater wealth and glory and higher literary excellence than the foremost among modern nations. It was not the rich whom Christ pronounced "blessed," nor was it human honor and learning that He marked out as the characteristics of His followers. Let the contrast, then, between the nations alluded to, be all that it is said to be, or let it be admitted that England and Germany are really as happy and prosperous as they are represented, the argument is beside the point, and actually borrows its major premise from the temptation of our Lord by Satan: "All the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them . . . . all these will I give thee." But, baseless as this argument against Catholic teaching is in itself, there are facts connected with it which require explanation, and which, with some persons, may stand for arguments.

That there are most scandalous things done in Catholic countries, there can be no question; that, in them, there have been most flagrant violations of justice, and of Christian faith and manly honor, no one will deny; but, to what source these crimes are to be attributed, and under what influence and by what agency they have increased, men often overlook. Before them are effects, shocking to Christian sense and decorum, and they care not to look into the cause of them, or even to read the candid statements of those who have done so. There are, however, involved in the subject considerations which every honest man ought to take into account; (1), some of them touching the relations between faith and moral conduct; (2), others, regarding the difficulties of arriving at an adequate estimate of the criminality of a people; and (3), others, again, derived from obstacles put in the way of the mission of the Church.

And, first of all, the truth is often ignored that moral conduct does not follow from the teaching of supernatural faith as a necessary consequence, neither can it be estimated according to a fixed uniform law, after the manner of physical phenomena. There is no tie which binds a man's action to this or that special motive, as, for instance, combustion is allied to fire, or physical bodies to the law of gravitation. In human agency, the motive and action are not precisely in the relation of physical cause to physical effect, and this because of the medium of man's free will. By this "perilous gift" man is created the master of his actions, responsible for his conduct in this world to his Maker, and with divine grace the builder of his fortune in the next. He can, as consciousness tells him, comply with God's law, profit by His graces and gifts, or these same gifts and graces he can fling back into God's face, trample on all law, and, by indulging wild passion, take to himself the malice of a fiend. All this he has the physical, native will-power of doing; out of his own perverse nature he can, there-

fore, forge his own fetters, and, by living until death an enemy of his Creator, can create his own hell. Judas did so. Such, then, conscience testifying, is the naked force of free-will in man. On the other hand, faith does not constrain that will; it does not hold the mind to itself by the luminousness of evidence, as if by a self-evident axiom, nor does it produce for reason a metaphysical but a moral certitude. The grounds of Christian belief do not flash on the mind their evidence with the force of a mathematical demonstration, although with a wider and an incomparably stronger grasp they seize on man's whole being, intellectual and moral. Men will readily die for their faith, but hardly, I should think, for the truth of a mathematical problem. Faith, as presented by the Church, is a stronger motive-power for souls than even evidence, and moral certitude a firmer basis of action than metaphysical reasoning. Still, this certitude does not so rivet the will to faith that, should man yield to temptation, he cannot shake it off, nor does it so bind the human will to God's law that it cannot break it. Man's submission to Catholic faith, God wishes, should be a free offering, a homage coming from a free will and a free heart, a "reasonable service," grounded on the illumination of faith and on man's co-operation with it.

Catholics, then, no matter of what nation, have the bare physical power of resisting God's revelation, and of becoming rebels to Him and to His Church. This conclusion, drawn from the consciousness of each one, is easily admitted. But here the further question arises: Why do Catholics, in the countries spoken of, apostatize, as it were, in such numbers, and with such shameless professions of blatant infidelity? Just after leaving the mother of their faith, they rage against her with the frenzy of energumens. To many persons this conduct is unaccountable; there are influences about it which they cannot see nor fathom, but which the true, faithful believer may easily discern. For him there is enough in the beginnings of Christianity to teach him that apostasy from the faith of Christ often begets the deadliest hatred of it, even treason, like that of Judas, and cruel intentions, like unto those of the Scribes and Pharisees. It was of apostates that the Apostle wrote, they "were made partakers of the Holy Ghost and are fallen away, ... crucifying again to themselves the Son of God, and making Him a mockery." The light of divine faith in their souls they have eclipsed by the darkness of passion; the work of God's grace in them they have undone, and the spouse of Christ, who loved them, they have shamefully abandoned. But, do what they may, or go where they may, they cannot escape her shadow, and when they would try to cast her out from their sight, she rises before them like a spectre. To this unnatural rage of apostates from the

Catholic Church the calm charity of converts from all Christian denominations is in marked contrast. For them there is no breaking of the laws of divine faith, no tearing asunder by sacrilegious hands of God's work, but the departure from the region of the darkness of error into the kingdom of the light of truth, the joyful entrance, after having wandered in the by-paths of heresy, into the home on earth of their Lord and their God.[1]

In regard to Christian sects themselves, their bonds of union, severally, are so loose, their faith so undefined and unsettled in its authority, that men pass from one to the other apparently with as much unconcern as they change their lodging. To their conduct no censure is attached by public opinion, no charge of unfaithfulness to solemn obligations is brought against them, and hardly no estrangement of former acquaintances is felt by them. On the score of mere argument nothing can be said against them, since they have only followed out logically the very first lesson of Protestantism, namely, the doctrine of private judgment in determining one's creed. To be sure, this doctrine, in despite of logic, has been modified by the formulas of faith of various sects, but the primal rule of the new faith has never been expressly abrogated; no matter to what Christian denomination one belongs, he feels that back of the hedge of the special teaching of his co-religionists there is always open to him a way, through which he may separate from them, without a breach of his faith in Protestantism. This marking out for God the creed by which man intends to serve Him, is ludicrous indeed, and yet painfully sad in its far-reaching consequences, but for all the hollowness and falsity that lie beneath it the world cares very little. Without even the shadow of reproach from it, men may glide as often as they please from one sectarian communion to another, or out of them all into a negation of all creeds and into agnosticism. What the world often resents, and that in no measured terms, is the generous conduct of those who abandon the temples of error for the Church of the living God.

In its very marrow, then, Protestantism has its own solvent, so that, unnoticed by the world at large, hundreds can change one form of it for another, or merely hang on to it, and nominally belong to a Christian communion; and thus a people silently and imperceptibly can renounce their faith, to a considerable extent, without attracting much public notice by the process. Statistics go to show that the Anglican Establishment, in a numerical sense, is no longer the national church of England. This fact does not

1 "I have always observed," writes Count Stolberg, a convert to the Catholic Church, "that the worst Catholics become very easily the best Protestants, and even parsons; but it is my everyday's experience that a good Protestant, such as I was, finds it a very hard work to become even a passable Catholic."

attract or shock the sense of the public, but apostasy from the Catholic Church they seem to look on as a prodigy, and this particularly when it is inflamed by political passion and made to cover, as it were, past wrong-doing. Then, no right, no sense of justice, no decency, will restrain the apostate spirit. The end it has in view it will try to reach, it cares not how; it will tear down the State, if it think that necessary in order to pull down the Church, and will rake up every past calumny or scandal in order to cast it at her. That this apostate spirit animates the anti-Christian factions of Catholic nations their acts sufficiently bear witness. With might and main they are striving to undermine all Catholic institutions, to belittle the Catholic clergy, and, if possible, to efface the Catholic name, and the see of Peter. Comparatively few in number, these radicals, by their reckless daring, and with State support, have conquered their position. Heeding no law but the watchword of their party, they strike terror by their outrages into the hearts of the timid, and through an irreligious press poison the minds of millions with their vicious doctrines. The rebellious clamor which they raise is echoed day after day through the world, until at last, in many quarters, it is believed that there is something socially and religiously wrong with Catholic nations. The virtues of their people keep them aloof from that wretched mob, and a sense of self-respect, perhaps, or, it may be, the strength and military resources of their enemy, hinder them from opposing force by force.

But here the critical temper will probably not be satisfied with the statement that the present Italian disorder is the work of a handful of Italian revolutionists. It will insist that the source of this religious and political discontent is deeper and more widespread, or that it is the result of bad morals and of bad education. Now, in regard to the morality of a people, if morality be taken in its adequate sense, I admit that it is impossible to state it in figures; its source is beyond the ken of human observation, and its essential quality cannot be gauged by any human experiment. It is in the human heart that morality is essentially formed. It is there that it is conceived and begotten in its specific nature. There it springs from deliberate thoughts and desires and motives, and, because it depends on the advertence of the mind and the free deliberateness of the will, it qualifies necessarily every deliberate rational act. The external object and its circumstances, the objective law or its violation, man by his deliberate will assimilates, as it were, to his purpose, and by his motive or aim gives them a moral character. Down deep in the heart reason, or conscience, which is "somehow a dictate of reason," applies the eternal law, the invariable, primary rule of right and wrong, to actual thoughts and words and

actions. "From the heart," says Christ, "come forth evil thoughts, murders, adulteries, fornications, thefts, false testimonies, blasphemies." The external act, indeed, if, of its own nature, it be good or bad, will communicate its goodness or badness to man's disposition; or, again, by the application of the purpose which it supposes, or by the repetition of acts which may precede it, will intensify those dispositions for good or for evil. The injustice, also, or scandal, or uncharitableness, that may be connected with an external sinful act, will add to its sinfulness; while, on the other hand, the edification that results from virtuous action will enhance its worth; but, in either case, the primal root of morality will be in the human heart, and man's merit or demerit will mainly spring from the deliberate intents of the soul. He can, therefore, entertain a deliberate purpose of murder, and close his heart on it; no human eye sees it, and no friend or foe knows of it; it is seen and known in the fulness of its malice by God alone. Such a one can also commit many sinful acts privately without the knowledge of any human being, and society, having no data for censure, has no right to misjudge him. Men see only external facts, but these, unless in themselves evil, or necessarily implying deliberate malice, do not make morals. Courts of justice, even, do not take cognizance so much of the violation of a law, as of the deliberateness there was in the violation. By testimony, by manifold investigation, they want to know how far the accused was responsible for his act, whether it was deliberate or the result of momentary impulse, and according to the conclusion come to on this count they pass sentence. Under the calm covering, therefore, of a polished society there may lie much viciousness, dark envy, and hatred, and jealousy, an insatiable pride and vanity, plans of murder and of theft, and sodden impurity in its most loathsome forms, while to the eye all is generally decorum, persons and things being kept in their place by minute police regulations. From these reflections we may infer that statistics can give only an imperfect knowledge of the morality of a people. But, besides, they are a hard, cruel record. Into them do not enter the extenuating circumstances of sin, such as temptations, indeliberateness, ignorance, or poverty. In them there is often no account taken of the degrees of guilt, but criminals are classified under some general heading, as, for instance, when the inmates of a penitentiary are written down "convicts," this term covering the crime of the astute, trained swindler of $10,000, as well as that of the thief who, perhaps, pinched by poverty, stole some few articles for his immediate relief. But, such as they are, statistics of crime are useful, both to the statesman in order that he may know whereon to legislate, and to the preacher of God's word in order that he may learn against what vices par-

ticularly he should warn his hearers. Indeed, occasionally, for some years past, statistics of crime have been appealed to as a test of religions. The issue was raised on the comparative morality of Protestant and Catholic countries, and sides were taken by the advocates of both. In the discussions that followed some persons seemed to think that moral and religious truth was to be proved by a sum in arithmetic, and that the orthodoxy of a creed was solely to be estimated from the small number of the sins of those who professed it. Well, great researches were made; town-registers, parliamentary reports, national almanacs, were examined, and the conclusion was reached that, even on the score of morals in figures, Catholic nations more than held their own. Among them, Italy was acknowledged by all parties to be one of the highest; but it is fair to add that this acknowledgment was made while the Pope was in actual possession of temporal sovereignty. The controversy at the time was principally about facts, but had it taken a wider range and searched into the sources of Christian morality, it could have found apt illustrations of its theme in the religious history of the last three hundred years.

The very surroundings of the new faith, in the sixteenth century, furnished proofs of what that faith could do in the way of producing religious and moral goodness. From the nations which embraced it it received every facility for developing the resources of its teachings. It had state protection and support; all obstacles to its propagation were removed; it had wealth, and the education of all classes under its control; and yet, what the deplorable results of its principles were, the very authors of the so-called Reformation were forced to admit. To Luther one of the most disheartening reflections was, that wherever his doctrines spread immorality spread with them, and that the people, under this new gospel, so far from having more respect for the word of God, despised it, interpreting it to suit their own fancy, and attributing to it the great increase of crime then prevalent.

"It is deplorable," said he, "that among our own there is found so much scandal, and so little true amendment. This condition of things is the reason why the worldly-wise (?) thus object to our gospel: 'If it were really a holy and sanctifying doctrine, it would not make people worse instead of making them better.'[1] . . . . With the exception of a very small number, who receive our preaching with favor and gratitude, all others are ungrateful, dissipated, imprudent. . . . . The men who live according to our gospel are more given to hatred, more choleric, more lustful, more avaricious than they were under Popery. The more one preaches and propagates the gospel the worse things become. . . . The peasants have

[1] Dr. Dœllinger, "La Reforme," etc., vol. i., pp. 203, 306.

come to such a degree of license that they imagine that there is nothing forbidden to them . . . . 'We have the faith,' they say; 'that ought to suffice.'"

On this same subject Erasmus wrote: "Has not Luther himself avowed that he would prefer to live still under the rule of the popes and the monks than with that race of men (his own followers) who, under the gospel, lead the lives of Sybarites? Melanchthon, in his letters, has made the same avowal, and Œcolampadius, in his conferences, says the same thing."[1]

These citations from among many of the like kind that might be made from the writings of the first so-called Reformers, force on us the inference that the increase of immorality at that time, in Germany, was the outcome of the working of the doctrines of the new faith. It was then in the flush of its first development, putting forth all the energy it could command, for bettering the world, and still, by its teachings, the world became worse. In the circumstances it was no wonder that men should apply the test, "by their fruits you shall know them." But here, in all fairness, it should not be forgotten that in the web of divine and human elements that form Christian morality the human will is a great factor. It can reject the choicest graces, abuse the best doctrines, and originate the wretched fallacy which makes the abuse of a thing to be the standard of its value, teaches that a law is bad because men often break it, or that a religious system is wrong because those who adhere to it sin against it. To disapprove the fallacy, however, that system must not be defective in the least in its constituent parts; it must clearly show forth its divine origin, and give ample practical proof of its elevating, sanctifying power. No degree of zeal or philanthropy, no sincere devotedness of a single life to God's service, and no works performed from the purest motives, can stanch the radical defects and errors of a religious creed. Good grain does not spring from cockle; men do not gather grapes of thorns, nor figs of thistles.

Now in its constitution the new religion embodied the principle that when there is question of moral good or evil man's will has no liberty of choice, and if he sin, it is in virtue of a predetermining divine decree. Liberty, however, it was admitted, he has, but it is not that which lies in the very choice of the will, but that which consists merely in immunity from external restraint; not that which makes man a moral agent, the master of his own acts, and responsible for them, but that which gives him power to roam at large, unfettered. It was in this latter sense that Luther's following, and, more openly still, that of Calvin, understood human liberty. Their definition, dealing with the accident, and not with the essence

[1] Ib., p. 18.

of the thing defined, sufficed, however, for their purpose. They could not do away with free will altogether; against that the moral consciousness and experience of the human race protested; but, by retaining the word, and changing its meaning, they promoted their own opinions, and did not shock the common sense of the world. Men, prone to sin, were satisfied to be told that their vicious acts were not imputable to them, and, though their souls may have recoiled from making God the author of evil, they were content to leave that enormity to their teachers, to be settled by them as best they could. But the floodgates of evil were opened, and it was not the fault of this new religious teaching that the world was not inundated by immorality.

What the disintegrating nature of the doctrine of "private judgment" was and is, we have already alluded to; fomenting pride, it is as a canker-worm in the dogmatic teaching of Protestantism, and a temptation for the interpreting of the moral teaching of the Gospel to suit caprice or inclination. The Reformation had not an existence of five years when the sect of the Anabaptists arose, between whom and the Lutherans, according to Mœhler, there was an undeniable affinity. "An indescribable confusion," he adds, "prevailed in the minds of the new sectaries, and a fearful fanaticism drove them to every species of extravagance and violence."

The Antinomians, using the license granted them in dealing with God's word, upheld, as their principal tenet, that they were not bound by the moral law. The Hernhutters sent an embassy to Luther to protest against the immorality of his disciples, while, says Dr. Milner, they denied "that even the moral law, as contained in the Scriptures, is a rule of life for believers."

These and other sects were the natural logical outcome of the broad, loose principles of the new faith,—the conclusions drawn from the doctrines which the Reformers preached. To be sure they protested against such conclusions, but they had sown the wind, they had laid down the premises, and it was now idle on their part to quarrel with the conclusions. If these were bad, it was because the source from which they had been derived was vicious. Had a glimpse of the future been vouchsafed to Luther and Calvin, they could have seen how, in this century, their views worked themselves out to their extreme length in the schools of Strauss and Bruno Bauer.

The great majority, however, of those who embraced the principles of the new creed shrank from those sectaries, and condemned their immoral practices as forcibly as did all orthodox Christians. But this they did, not in virtue of any intrinsic elements of their creeds, but by the force of strong common sense, as well as of the Catholic traditions which were around them. These traditions

were as so many subtle influences that entered into social life, that gave its character to Christian civilization; recognized or not, they had a bearing on the conduct and discipline of every Christian community, underlay much of the literature of the age, and were blended largely with the legislation of all Christian nations. The atmosphere in which Christian nations live is impregnated, as it were, by those traditions; and, as we learn from the work of Dr. Morselli, when brought in contact with non-Catholic teaching, will serve to clear up that dark gloom of soul which lures some persons to self-destruction.

In consequence, then, of those imperceptible Catholic influences, and of the restraining powers of the moral law, many non-Catholics were and are better than their religious principles. But what the standing of Protestant Christianity is in the world of to-day, and how its inherent defects are reaching their final ends, Mr. Mallock describes in his work, *Is Life Worth Living?*

"It is at last beginning to exhibit to us," he writes, "the true result of the denial of infallibility to a religion that professes to be supernatural. We are at last beginning to see in it neither the purifier of a corrupted revelation, nor the corrupter of a pure revelation, but the practical denier of all revelation whatever. It is fast evaporating into a mere natural theism, and is thus showing us what, as a governing power, natural theism is. Let us look at England, Europe, and America, and consider the condition of the entire Protestant world. Religion, it is true, we shall find in it, but it is religion from which not only the supernatural element is disappearing, but in which the natural element is fast becoming nebulous."—P. 268.

The very contrary of all this he writes of the Catholic Church. Guided by the Holy Spirit, she exalts man while she teaches him. The lowering of one's reason to a fellow-man to be instructed by him, although often perfectly legitimate and justly prescribed, has in it, however, something humiliating for human nature; but the submitting of the soul to the infinite reason of God teaching through His Vicar on earth or His Church is an exaltation for human reason, an ennobling of man's nature. The Catholic is not left to the caprice of any man for what he is to believe, nor is his creed fashioned for the occasion from the opinions of men, but his soul rests on God's word as infallibly declared to him, and his creed is derived from divine revelations infallibly interpreted for him. In the doctrines which he believes there exist perfect harmony and the highest sanctity; in every shade of relationship they hold together with the fullest consistency, and when lived up to produce the greatest fruits of holiness, as all Christian history teaches. In regard to the nature and the attributes of God the teaching of the Church

is in keeping with His supreme, infinite sanctity; in regard to man it recognizes the noble faculties of his nature and strives to impress on him the sense of his high destinies. In season, out of season, the Church preaches the authentic word of God, strictly enforces the observance of the decalogue, encourages the profession of the evangelical councils, educates all classes, enjoins fasts and abstinence, and binds her children under grievous penalty to the hearing of mass on Sundays and holy-days. By these and many other means she endeavors to promote Christian piety and good morals among her children, or to restrain the evil propensities of fallen nature. Through the sacraments left to her by her divine Founder as so many channels of grace she reforms, comforts, strengthens souls. The tribunal of penance alone is the greatest school of moral teaching in the world. In it the Church by her ministers instructs each soul individually, and applies to it the laws of the Gospel; she solves doubts, lays down principles of conduct, exacts promises of amendment, exhorts, consoles, corrects; the claims of justice she vindicates, and by her advice repairs or strengthens the bonds of fraternal charity. Through the humble confession of the penitent she looks into the source of all morality, the human heart, and, if need be, applies remedies to its hidden wounds. At this tribunal the learned and unlearned—Pope, king, and beggar—alike kneel to be instructed and judged according to Christ's great mercy.

Of the sacrament of penance Leibnitz wrote: "Nor can it be denied that this is an ordinance in every respect worthy of the divine wisdom, and if there be in the Christian religion anything admirable and deserving of praise, assuredly it is this institution which won the admiration even of the people of China and Japan, for by the necessity of confessing, many, especially those who are not yet hardened, are deterred from sin, and to those who have actually fallen it affords great consolation, insomuch that I regard a pious, grave, and prudent confessor as a great instrument of God for the salvation of souls; for his counsel assists us in governing our passions, in discovering our vices, in avoiding occasions of sin, in making restitution, in repairing injuries, in dissipating doubts, in overcoming despondency, and in fine in removing or mitigating all the ills of the soul. And if in the ordinary concerns of life there is nothing more precious than a faithful friend, what must it be to have a friend who is bound by even the inviolable obligation of a divine sacrament to hold faith with us and assist us in our need?"[1]

In order, however, that those resources of the Church should be of avail for the bettering of men, she must be free to use them. To deny her this freedom and then come and reproach her with

[1] A System of Theology. Translated by Charles William Russell, D.D.

the ignorance and viciousness of her people sounds like the bitterest irony. According to Christ's design she must be perfectly free in superintending the education of her children, blending largely with it her own teaching on faith and morals; in her disciplinary laws, in her property-rights, in the administration of the sacraments she must be free,—free to preach, to teach, to reprove, —uncontrolled in her relations with her supreme head, the Roman Pontiff, and perfectly unrestrained in the full exercise of her divine jurisdiction. We have seen how Protestantism has been supported by the state, but the Catholic Church has not often met, in modern times, with the same good fortune. Influenced by ambitious views or swayed by heretical or infidel teaching temporal rulers have often curtailed or trampled on her rights, robbed her of her property, and this while they encouraged rebellion against her authority. Some of her children, even, rejecting "faith and a good conscience," like Hymeneus and Alexander, of whom the apostle speaks, "have made shipwreck concerning the faith." Under this point of view thousands of facts might be ranged to illustrate the subject. At present we shall confine ourselves to some events of Italian history for the last hundred years.

Opposition to the Church in Catholic countries is often, by reason of its complex character, a puzzle to the popular mind. What open, downright persecution is, it can easily understand; but this opposition which comes from diplomacy, or from the secret plotting of nominal Catholics, or from the effects of bad literature, or from the extravagant sympathies of nationalism, it cannot so well appreciate. The antagonism of enemies or unbelievers it is prepared for, but the official intrigue and uncatholic conduct of "false brethren," and these representative men, it hardly expects. To this unseemly state of things phrases that are in common use contribute not a little; the worrying of the Church by the government of a Catholic nation persons will speak of as if it were the conduct of the nation itself; they will not take into account that that government either professes no religion at all, or bases its policy on false or heretical principles, or even that it is a Jew or an infidel or a Calvinist who is its chief organ, or who, perhaps, holds the *portefeuille* of a minister of worship. And as in everyday life it is from the political order principally that the world at large comes to know a nation, men will be prone to judge of its character from the acts of its government. They will judge, for instance, of the moral or religious tone of France or of Austria from the political measures taken by the French or Austrian governments, although these measures may be in direct conflict with the teaching of the Church. In the estimate that is formed of Catholic nations, it is often also ignored that some of them have not been exclusively

Catholic. Almost from the dawn of the Reformation Protestantism or its offshoot, Jansenism, settled in them, sat sometimes even near the throne, opened its schools and churches, and put forth in writing its views on religion and government. It flattered state power, and this, ambitious and aggressive enough surely in the past, now frequently pushed its resistance to the Church even beyond the lines of orthodoxy. French kings and Austrian emperors sometimes arrogated to themselves rights which belong only to the successors of St. Peter.

To judge fairly of the condition of Catholic countries and of their influence one on the other, it is necessary to take the foregoing facts into consideration. In their light we shall study the disturbing elements of Italian life. Composed of kingdoms, of republics, of duchies, of Austrian provinces, and of the Papal States, Italy, towards the close of the last century, was under laws and customs that varied with the nature and spirit of her governments. The battlefield of Europe for centuries, and torn by the quarrels of internal factions, she inherited some of the political principles of the nations that had ruled her. At one time it was the political views of France that were in the ascendant in her counsels, at another those of Spain, but generally it was those of Germany. This latter country, claiming to be the heir of the holy Roman Empire, seemed to think that Italy was under German tutelage, and was not able to stand by herself without the support of the imperial successors of Henry IV. and of Frederick Barbarossa. Up to a few years since the richest Italian provinces belonged to the house of Hapsburg, while Italian dukes or kings were often united to the same house by ties of kindred or by treaties. In the last quarter of the eighteenth century Lombardy was subject to the eldest son of that noble empress, Maria Theresa. Leopold, her second son, became Duke of Tuscany, and Ferdinand, her third son, Duke of Modena; Caroline, one of her daughters, was married to Ferdinand, King of Naples, while another of them, Maria Amelia, was wife of the Duke of Parma. Under Maria Theresa herself the Church was, at least, externally in the enjoyment of her rights; though, at the time, Jansenism and Gallicanism together were striving to change her constitution by exaggerating the powers of the episcopal office, and consequently by lessening the Pope's authority in matters of faith and his jurisdiction in matters of ecclesiastical government and discipline. Even then, through the influence of Joseph II., the University of Vienna was infected with Jansenism. Dutch professors tried to introduce it into court circles, and its advocates sometimes supplanted Catholic teachers in the very ecclesiastical seminaries of the empire. So relaxed had clerical discipline grown, or so remiss had the clergy

become in defending the rights of the Church, that the temper of many of them was not averse to some, at least, of the religious innovations introduced by the Emperor. Without any vigorous protest or opposition, he could decree that no bull, or rescript, or brief of the Pope should be published in his dominions unless it had received the imperial placet. Without the consent of the Emperor bishops should not confer holy orders; religious associations were suppressed, monasteries and convents were turned into military barracks, and a politico-moral catechism was taught in the schools, the leading principles of which were nationalism and an aversion to all foreign spiritual authority. "It was ordained that the text of the bull *Unigenitus* should be removed from any theological work in which it might be found, and that professors should speak of it only as a purely historical document without any religious value," says Darras. To this legislation the Church in Lombardy was subjected; her bishops, nominated by the Emperor, were merely to be confirmed by the Pope; meanwhile, her seminaries were suppressed, and the teaching of her colleges leavened with the false theories of the age.

However, Joseph II. was not averse to ecclesiastical knowledge, provided it was according to his own taste. In place of the seminaries he founded a general university at Pavia, and, in spite of the censures of Rome, appointed therein professors who favored his views. Natali, who had been censured by the Holy See for teaching Jansenism, became professor of theology. Zola, whose works were put on the Index, taught ecclesiastical history; and Tamburini, who was imbued with Gallican opinions and became afterwards secretary to the heretical synod of Pistoia, filled the chair of canon law and natural right.

While this legislation was unsettling the faith of some of the inhabitants of Lombardy, a more open and hostile attack was made on it in Tuscany. Its Grand Duke, Leopold, favored not only the curtailment of ecclesiastical rights, but with all his authority supported the teaching of Jansenistic doctrines. Unfaithful churchmen were found to second the views of their duke, because these flattered their ambition. Under the apostate prelate Ricci a synod was held at Pistoia in which heresy was clearly taught, the discipline of the Church changed, devotions and ceremonies abolished, and the authority of the Holy See slighted and set at naught. Education in all its departments was expected to conform to the new teaching, and for this end Leopold sent to the bishops—if you please—the catechisms which they were to use in their respective dioceses. He also pointed out the books that should be read by the faithful, laid down rubrics for religious solemnities and processions, explained how the church-bell was to be

rung, and how a corpse was to be buried, and, in short, acted "the sacristan," like his imperial brother of Austria.

Jansenism became the court doctrine at Florence, religious orders were forbidden to correspond with any authority outside the boundaries of the state, and it came to be well understood that unless one were a rebel to Rome he could not be the friend of Cæsar. The Tuscan people, however, were worried by changes which struck at the roots of their religion and did away with objects of their liveliest and most cherished veneration. Their strong, simple Catholic faith could not brook heresy, and was decidedly averse to accepting it either from duke or from bishop. The irreligion of the court of Florence had its counterpart in the scandals of the court of Parma. Here a spirit of opposition to Catholicity had been created by the wily statesman Du Tillot, until, little duchy as it was, it became as impertinent towards the Church as if it had an army of one hundred thousand men to back its insolence. The Duke of Modena was more moderate in his views than either his brother of Austria or he of Florence, but still he held on to that policy which cramps the Church's action and hinders her from putting forth all her energy in behalf of souls.

In the south of Italy at this period things were no better than in the north, although in the south the fault lay with the house of Bourbon, and not with that of Hapsburg. Charles, the son of Philip V. of Spain, having become Duke of Parma, afterwards succeeded to the crown of Naples, and, on the death of his brother, to that of Spain. Naturally weak-minded, Charles III. was ruled by his ministers. While in Parma, Tanucci became his confidant and accompanied him to Naples to become his prime minister. On the promotion of Charles to the throne of Spain, his son Ferdinand, at the age of eight years, succeeded him and had Tanucci as president of the council of the regency for the kingdom of the Two Sicilies. A lawyer by profession and an extreme liberal in his religious views, Tanucci ignored the principles of Christian statesmanship. Through the influence of Gallican and Jansenistic teaching, to thwart the Holy See in the exercise of its rights and to interfere with the ordinary discipline of the Church was generally the policy of that period through European nations. Into it the Neapolitan statesman entered largely. Without his permission the Pope could not correspond with the faithful of the Neapolitan kingdom; bishops were not permitted to ordain priests or to inflict censures but at the discretion of Tanucci; convents were suppressed, ecclesiastical property sequestrated, and education withdrawn, in great measure, from the superintendence of the Church. To the want of religion Tanucci joined a want of humanity. In order to keep his place he had Ferdinand reared like a boor; and,

to satisfy the instincts of hatred, had hundreds of unoffending religious men cast on the Pope's territories. Still this was the man whose word was law in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies for forty-three years.

It was certainly a singular anomaly and a historical scandal to see how Catholic kings behaved towards the Holy See as if they were so many Turks. But the truth is the state-doctrines and state-pride of a few centuries had given them extravagant pretensions and led them into wrong views about the nature and powers of the kingly office. Established for the temporal well-being or happiness of the people, the state is called upon to take all lawful means to secure that end. By laws, by a just policy, by financial arrangements, by promoting enterprise, by supplying the means of education, by succoring distress under every form, and by contributing to all the arts of civilized life, it may further national greatness or interest. In this sphere of duty the state is independent, provided all the while it conforms to natural justice and divine law. While dealing directly with the temporal as its special immediate object, it ought, however, for its own stability and under the direction of Christian jurisprudence, to protect morality and religion. The object of the Church, according to her divine Founder, is to fit men in time for the enjoyment of happiness in eternity. And as it is the end which a society has in view that gives it its specific character, the spiritual is the Church's great formative element; it underlies her government, it is embodied in the sacraments, it enters into her motives, into her labors, and into her manner of dealing with the world. This life-element men do not see and frequently do not understand, and therefore misinterpret her actions. They see how doggedly she holds to some grave point of ecclesiastical law, or to some term expressive of Catholic doctrine, and because she will not compromise principle they accuse her of uncalled-for obstinacy. In the circumstances the state would perhaps cut the Gordian knot by yielding to expediency, but the Church cannot do so; come what may, she must stand by God's truth, natural and supernatural. The "kingdom of God" on earth, she has received from His hands her organization and hierarchy, and her world-wide jurisdiction and her powers to distribute Christ's graces unto the salvation of souls; shaped in her fulness of form by the divine immediate action, she stretches her roots on earth into all natural equity, and sanctions, and elevates, and unfolds it.

Created, however, for men and bodily made up of men, the Church has her human side, and for her high purposes, according to Christ's appointment, needs human aid and coöperation. With a mission before her that aims at man's spiritual good here and hereafter, she ought not to be trammelled in the fulfilling of it; she

must be neither dependent on any earthly power for the due exercise of her authority, nor, if possible, should she be wanting in those temporal resources which enable her to discharge her functions. Her needs are manifold; she has needs arising from the support and training of her clergy, needs that come from the education of her children, from the distress of her poor, of her orphans, of her various missions, or from the expenses incurred in the proper maintenance of divine worship. To meet all these wants she requires funds, of course; and had the state always recognized what would be to its profit, it would surely not grudge to supply her with them. Then its taxes would not weigh so heavily on it, and men without any sense of humiliation would have been comforted in receiving relief from the generous, open-handed charity of religion. But, apart from that view, the Church, being an independent divinely appointed society, composed not of angels or disembodied spirits and needing temporal things for the furtherance of her mission, has, by divine law, a right to hold and possess property. As citizens her clergy do not forfeit their rights, and even by reason of their calling are bound to be loyal to the state. Allegiance to temporal rulers the Church teaches as a primary rule of civil life; and while she firmly upholds the rights of the people, she condemns all conspiracies and rebellions against lawful authority. She teaches, of course, with the apostle, that "there is no power but from God," and "therefore he that resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God."

In spiritual matters, or in things appertaining to faith and morals, all Catholics obey her teaching with unquestioning submission; in matters relating to the civil or political order they obey the just laws of the state. Their submission to the one does not interfere with their allegiance to the other, no more than the obedience which a son owes to his parents interferes with his civil duties towards his country. "The divine right," says St. Thomas, "which comes by grace, does not destroy the human right which is in the order of nature" (2 v., 2 c., qu. 10, art. 10). Man's allegiance to the Church is in the spiritual order, his allegiance to the state in the temporal order; his duties to both do not clash because the just requirements of both are different; they are distinct aspects or goals of life to which he tends by distinct lines of duty, and these even in the natural order he may multiply without putting one in conflict with the other. A person does not become a rebel to his state, because he submits to the laws of a literary club, or of a trades-union, or of a royal society.

How compatible civil allegiance is with submission to ecclesiastical authority, or how the same person is bound in conscience to obey, in their respective spheres, the Pope and the king, Holy

Scripture often teaches. We have seen with what emphasis St. Paul inculcates obedience to temporal lords, but with greater emphasis still he enjoins obedience to ecclesiastical authority. "Remember your prelates," he writes, "who have spoken the word of God to you, whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation." And again, "Obey your prelates and be subject to them" (Heb. ch. 13, v. 7–17). These are inspired interpretations of the great saying of our divine Lord, "Render, therefore, to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's."

Those principles derived from the elementary teaching of Christian doctrine were frequently slighted or ignored by lay temporal Italian rulers at the end of the last century. They treated the Church as if she were a dependent power, and seemed to consider the temporal first and the spiritual after. Since the sixteenth century there was much, indeed, in regal assumption to confuse their idea of royalty. In the nations which embraced Protestantism the temporal sovereign came to be recognized, expressly or virtually, as head of the Church as well as head of the state, and his high tribunal also came to be considered as the source of all jurisdiction, spiritual and civil, within the realm. Hobbes maintained even that the king has absolute power to impose a religion on his subjects, and to render, therefore, a refusal to obey it an act of rebellion. The centralization of power thus became the great national policy; chartered privileges, Catholic immunities, municipal rights, provincial parliaments were abolished, and "public law was proclaimed the sole rule of morals," "the citizen's only conscience," says Hobbes. These public institutions which in Catholic ages were so many checks on royalty were now merged in the centralized governments that became the fashion through Europe.

"It is remarkable," writes Balmes, "that the greatest increase of royal power dates from the commencement of Protestantism." The new religion was not only the solvent of faith but also of civil liberty; and men found out that in pulling down the Church they also pulled down the guardian of their rights as freemen. They put her away by denying her divine authority, her lawful inheritance, and they fell under the state which claimed the exercise of divine powers to which it had no right. They were quite bewildered and overpowered for the time. But the lever wherewith they overturned the Church they were aware they might also use to overturn the state; if they applied "private judgment" to destroy faith, they saw no reason why they should not employ the same to destroy governments. Revolution or civil dissension followed in the wake of the so-called Reformation as a necessary consequence. These were doctrines that permeated some European

nations in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and though not accepted by Catholic rulers or peoples, were not, however, without their influence on them. In Italy they had their expression in what has been called Josephism and in a certain unsettling of Catholic loyalty, but did not affect, in any material way, the faith of the Italian people. They were, however, the prelude of fearful ruin.

Ever since the opening of the French Constituent Assembly Italy was not at ease. The echoes of the revolution were heard along her borders, and her rulers, great and small, occupied themselves about their prospects in the coming crisis. Piedmont and Savoy gave asylum to French royalists; King Victor Amedæus even, by invading French territory, was so rash as to provoke a French invasion. In the campaign that ensued some victories were gained by the French troops over the Austrians and Italians, but none of great account, until Napoleon Bonaparte was appointed commander of the Army of Italy. Eminent in the arts of peace, Italians, by training, were better fitted to embellish their country than to defend it,—and this especially against men of iron-courage who had crossed swords with Germans and English in many a battle, and had been inured to bloodshed in the streets of Paris and on the plains of La Vendée. State after state went down before the French army; Parma, Modena, Tuscany, were disorganized; the Pope had to give up Ferrara, Bologna, and the Romagna, out of all of which Napoleon formed the Cisalpine republic. Pius VI. died in exile, and when Italy became a kingdom, and France an empire, Pius VII. was led to Paris, and confined a prisoner at Fontainebleau. From the Alps to Calabria there was confusion through Italy. French invasion of her territory was not only an invasion of armies, but much more, an invasion of ideas. It scattered broadcast through the nation the maxims taught by the French Assembly of 1789, introduced the Italian mind to the irreligious sarcasm of Rousseau and Voltaire, and covered the country with the impious writings of heretics and infidels.

"The philosophical doctrines," says Farini, "which take their name from the encyclopedists, had penetrated among us during the sway of the French, so that the authority of Rome had greatly declined among the educated classes, and men thought and wrote in the French manner." The Code Napoléon, infidel principles, and the French school system were imported into Italy. Bonaparte, in the spirit of mean spite, which was in keeping with his nature, as we learn from the *Mémoires* of Madame de Rémusat, insisted that Catholic bishops and priests should swear to maintain the doctrines of the four condemned Gallican propositions of 1682. It was a crisis, or a time for sifting souls. Cardinals and bishops who

stood nobly by their post were either exiled or imprisoned by this imperial tyrant, and humble priests who were true to conscience were sometimes banished from their country, sometimes forced to labor among the slave-gangs of Toulon. "Napoleon," writes Cardinal Pacca, "had recourse to the species of tyranny imagined by Julian the Apostate, to pervert the faithful, sometimes by perfidious acts of kindness, and at other times by threats and violence,—wearying the patience of the clergy by depriving them of their preferment, and subjecting them, by exile, to every species of inconvenience and suffering." Never, perhaps, since the time of Gregory VII. was there such a struggle of right against might, and never, we may say, did the divine power of the Church, in defence of justice and of the sovereignty with which Christ endowed her, come out in such majesty. Some churchmen, to be sure, through cowardice, went down in the fight, but the Church herself, in Italy, amid a flood of iniquity, stripped of all her temporal possessions, and hampered in her ministry, by penal legislation and anti-Christian officials, remained immovable on the rock —Peter. His apostolic firmness cost the Pope much, but it saved the sacredness of right.

Between 1796 and 1814 Italy was under French influence and partly under French rule. The current of her political life was quickened by foreign elements and the traditions of Catholic teaching partly broken up by the materialistic philosophy of Condillac.

But the teaching of the schools seems to many persons to be far removed from the practical issues of life. "What matters it," they would say, "what young fellows think about 'sensations and ideas,' about the special characteristics of the human soul, or about 'being' and 'substance,' and 'creation?' When they go into the world, they shall leave these behind them, and learn, in contact with men in daily life, all that befits a man." Nothing can be more false, nothing more contrary to experience. "The boy," according to the common saying, "is father to the man,"—a familiar manner of expressing the inspired proverb, "A young man according to his way, even when he is old, he will not depart from it." Inoculate a youth with the seed of a fatal disease, by degrees it will grow into his system, will wind itself around his nerves and muscles, will corrupt his blood, eat into his flesh, and consume his heart; or else give him only husks to eat, reduce him almost to starvation fare, or put him down in the prison-pit of a dark mine to work, or shut him up in a factory the livelong day, where he inhales fetid air, or steel-dust, or gas-vapors, in either case you ruin or undermine his bodily constitution. Much after the same manner you can ruin his soul, and wreck his Christian manhood. Teach that

youth false principles, impress them on his soul by the force of your authority, they will grow around his mind and his will, they will run into his thoughts, and be the lever of his actions and the standard by which he will judge things human and divine, and the rule according to which he will live for time and eternity. By his own will-power indeed, and by God's grace, he may right himself, but this is a difficult task, and one, as all know, which comparatively few accomplish. Or, give him only the bare facts of science, or the events of history, tinctured by a little bigotry; teach him the exact and natural sciences, and every form of human literature, on the one side you have trained him up to more than the height of a giant, on the other,—and that the essential one,—you have left him less than a pigmy. His moral nature, and his Christian faith, out of which Christian character and manhood are formed, you have omitted. You have freighted him, perhaps, with much knowledge, but you have given him no moral or religious principles wherewith to direct himself. The sails of his bark on the sea of life are filled, but he has no rudder to steer himself into port. Or, again, in regard to Catholic doctrine, put the youth on starvation fare, or worse, teach him his Catholic catechism only one hour a week or so. The rest of the time at school he must not invoke God, nor bow to the name and image of his Lord and Saviour, nor must he, under penalty, speak of, or profess faith in his mother, the one holy Catholic Church. He is hardly taught what his faith is, or what Christian morals are, nor how young and old in this life ought to fit themselves for another world. What can one expect from such an education? Within the range, however, of each of the suppositions just stated youths may be found who, owing to the special care of parents, or to certain providential influences, become good and upright Christians. But for this they have not, surely, to thank the schooling which they received.

At all events, the school system which Napoleon introduced into Italy, and the new ideas propagated there by the French army, and by French officials, were not without their evil influence on the middle classes of Italian society. All Napoleon's work toppled over with his fall, the French armies withdrew from Italian territory, but the cockle which they had sown remained and grew. After the Congress of Vienna, the former rulers of Italy came back to their thrones to find that they had now a new enemy to contend with. The secret societies, which had contributed largely to the terrific wrecking of the Church and State in France, and which, amidst torrents of human blood had upturned throne and altar, communicated their methods to Italian society. The Carbonari arose; emissaries, of every kind—republicans, red and black, so-

cialists of every stripe, total-depravity men, and no-religion men, swooped down on the Italian states as on their quarry.

The breezy words, "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity," were again used to fan the fire of rebellious souls. The nature and goodness of forms of government, the rights of kings and people, the grievances of the past, religion, liberty, and national unity were discussed in the cafés of every city and town and by the shopkeepers of every village. In the schools Brutus and the Scipios were the great themes for scholars, the grandeurs of ancient Rome, its liberty minus its slavery and immorality, were subjects on which orators glossed in ecstasies of rhetoric. By contrast, to heighten the coloring of the picture they drew, they did not fail to have a fling at the Church and the Holy See. They misrepresented some facts, ignored others, and did not hesitate, in order to gain their end, to tear out of the records of their country the brightest pages in the history of liberty. Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, Gregory II., Alexander III., whose authority was the bond of the Lombard league, the Italian republics; all these they passed over, forgetting, all the while, that, when there was question of civil liberty, to inveigh against the Popes was like judging Manlius in sight of the Capitol.

Liberty was in the spirit of those ages. "There are two things," said a mediæval monk, "for which every upright man ought to be ready even to shed his blood; these are justice and liberty."[1]

"In the Middle Ages," writes Walter, "self-government, which was preserved by the formation of corporations, was a means of satisfying the Teutonic spirit of freedom, and associations, with their abundant resources, elevated the interests of life and strengthened its energies. Thence came the wonderful wealth of creative power, which was seen to spring forth in that remarkable time, almost without help from the state, in every department of human existence, in science, art, political life, industry, commerce, and in devotion to the higher aims of life."[2]

In reality, indeed, to the minds of some of those orators alluded to, liberty was something very indefinite, a spell for fancy, or a conceit wherewith to inflate national aspirations. Their idea of it seemed to be that which Macaulay attributes to Horace Walpole: "His talk about liberty, whether he knew it or not, was, from the beginning, a mere cant, the remains of a phraseology which had meant something in the mouths of those from whom he had learned it, but which, in his mouth, meant about as much as the oath by

[1] Petrus. Blos. de Inst. Ep., p. iv.

[2] Naturrecht und Politik, p. 300, quoted by Cardinal Hergenröther, Church and State, p. 272, Eng. trans.

which the Knights of the Bath bind themselves to redress the wrongs of all injured ladies."

To another wing, however, and this the larger one, of the revolutionary faction, civil liberty was something more palpable. It was the expression in the civil order of the physical freedom of their wills in the natural order. In spite of the dictates of reason and the restraints of the moral law, they knew that they had the power of thinking out the most odious crimes and of purposing to commit them; at the beck of every passion in their hearts they could swing their souls, as it were, around the full circle of vice, and, as they could think and purpose as they pleased, they thought that they might also in social life, following the robbers' code, act as they pleased; or, as they could brutalize themselves by crime, that they might brutalize society by barbarism. Such was the sort of liberty that a knot of foreign socialists sought, a few years ago, to inaugurate in New York, in Tomkins Square. But they learned a lesson then, which will perhaps serve them in the future; they were taught by republican authority that to be free, as Lord Mansfield had said, "is to live under a government of law." Another pivot for their views on liberty they took from the fact that they disowned or rejected the authority of the Church. For them the Ten Commandments, as it would seem, had lost their binding force; they would listen neither to Bishop, nor to Council, nor to Pope,—their own liking, or that of their secret association, was their law, and, to their thinking, the governments of the Christian past were somehow leagued against liberty. They had put aside the authority of the Church, and now they thought that they might also put aside the authority of the State; the one they had rejected as a superstition, the other they would reject as a usurpation. For the State, however, they would substitute one of their own making, and would put into it the new liberty; but, as for the Church, they would try to make her pliant to their behests, and, if she would not consent, they would strive with all their might to dig her out from the very roots. These were some of the extravagant views on liberty that circulated among certain coteries of Italian society during the first few decades of this century. Indefinite at first, and only food for national vanity, they took shape, and acquired a body by the astute handling of Joseph Mazzini, the founder of the secret society, "Young Italy." Strange as it should seem, this revolutionary society received its great support from sources from which, perhaps, it had hardly expected it.

The great powers of Europe, worried and exhausted by the wars of a quarter of a century, through which they had passed, met in their representatives at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818, and formed themselves, as it were, into a high court of arbitration on all national European

troubles. Again, in a congress, held at Troppau in 1820, the supreme rulers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria decided that it was lawful for sovereigns to interfere in the internal affairs of other states in order to suppress rebellion against their lawful rulers, and to put this doctrine in practice, in a meeting held at Laybach, they authorized Austria to march her troops into the kingdom of Naples to reinstate its ruler, King Ferdinand. Against the doctrine of the meddling by foreign powers in the internal government of other nations England, through her prime minister, Castlereagh, strongly protested, although she had no difficulty in admitting the decision come to in regard to Naples. In relation to the unrestricted theory of intervention that had been formulated, the point of the protest was well taken; it respected the sovereignty of each state, and the independence and right which each government exclusively has of seeing to its own internal organization for the well-being of its people. But it overlooked that international charity which, in the family of nations, binds one state to succor another in its wants, when its legitimate authority asks for foreign aid, or when the self-préservation of a state may necessarily require the ordering of the condition of its neighbor. The policy of intervention adopted by the allied powers, and adopted and strenuously upheld by England afterwards, became most odious, and ran into flagrant injustice. The case of revolution, in which a ruler asked for foreign aid, or that condition of things in one country from which the security of neighboring states might be well endangered, were considered, apparently, not as exceptional, but entering necessarily into the policy or comity which should exist among nations. Kings seemed to think that they ought to be valets to each other, and that, under all circumstances, it was their duty to look to the maintaining of the splendor and etiquette of the royal dignity.

France had just got out of a revolution, and was still torn by violent factions; England, from one end to the other, heard her people violently clamoring for reform; the German Confederation was putting down local franchises and national yearning for constitutional government, while Russia was sharpening her sword anew, under the Emperor Nicholas, against her poor persecuted Catholic subjects. Still, it was the sovereigns of those nations, who, in 1831, presented a joint note to Pope Gregory XVI., counselling him to adopt reforms in the government of his dominions. By these confederated powers it was supposed that the Pope's temporal government was defective from top to bottom; that, in its financial, judicial, and municipal departments, it was a blot on the age, and that it was only by adopting a legislative system, such as existed in France or England, that it could become respectable in

the eyes of the world. Other cases of intervention in foreign states there had been, but none there was that outraged so grossly as this one the independence of a sovereign state, and became the cause, for many years, of so much disaffection among a loyal people. And what was the pretext for this insult offered by the potentates of Europe to a fellow-sovereign and the head of Catholic Christendom? A rebellion in the Romagna, got up by emissaries of secret societies, a rebellious spirit that had overturned a dynasty in France, dethroned monarchs in Spain and Italy, that was still felt beyond the Rhine, and was raging even through the cities of England. Pope Gregory felt what an indignity had been put upon him, and what a motive of action had been given to the secret societies by the conduct of the European powers. Under this trying ordeal of diplomacy he bore himself nobly, entering into no compromise with false liberalism, and upholding firmly his right to legislate for his own people as he judged fit. On this occasion it was pitiful to see the government of Louis Philippe, having more than enough to do at home, worrying itself about theories for the governing of the Papal States. It would promise its protection to the Holy See, only on condition that the reforms mentioned in the official "note" should become the basis of a new code, and that some of the concessions of the charter of Louis XVIII. should be taken as a lesson in legislation by the Sovereign Pontiff. The ambassadors of other European governments seconded the views of the French King, and thus right was called on to yield to intrigue, or to declare itself. To the French demand Cardinal Bernetti, papal secretary of state, answered: "That though the French guarantees appeared important to the Holy See, the Pope believed it impossible to secure them by measures which would amount to a real abdication of pontifical independence;" and to the other states he wrote, "This Roman See, apparently so weak, will never consent to sanction reforms which shall be dictated to it with a tone of imperiousness and with a day fixed for their fulfilment. It reserves to itself its liberty of action and its complete independence. Besides, by its conduct it has long since shown its zeal in looking for and realizing all the reforms desirable and compatible with public security."

Still, the French government persisted in urging the papal power to adopt the views of the diplomatic note or "memorandum;" even a French man-of-war in 1832, without any provocation whatever, bombarded Ancona and hung over it the tri-color; the Austrian army, to suppress an open rebellion, organized by the "secret sects," was forced to occupy the Romagna, while England,—the ambassadors of the other European powers complained,—was fatiguing them by her demands in favor of the revolutionary party.

When the Austrian troops withdrew from the papal territory Europe could see how the conspiracy unmasked itself, and all lovers of justice understood that the Carbonari had made use of European diplomacy to reach their end more safely. Prussia forthwith ordered Baron Bunsen, her plenipotentiary in Rome, to disavow the part he had taken in framing the "memorandum," or diplomatic note; Russia gave almost a like command to her representative; Austria would not sanction the document, in face of recent events; France was silent, though not satisfied; the English government alone publicly protested and demanded, through Lord Palmerston, for the Pope's dominions a representative government, unrestricted liberty of the press, and a national guard, half civil and half military. There certainly was in all this enough to confuse an ordinary statesman, and to cramp his policy, but the statesmanship of the Holy See, broadened by its sense of right, shook off these miserable tricks of politics, and held on to justice. Pope Gregory granted to his States the reforms which he considered suited to them, but, as the enemy was at his very door, he had to be reserved in his concessions, and to temper kindness with strictness. He died in June, 1846, and was succeeded by Pius IX.

Pius inaugurated his pontificate by granting an amnesty to those imprisoned for political offences, excepting, however, from its benefit those who, in sinning, had betrayed the official trust reposed in them. Reforms, most acceptable to the people, were introduced by him into the government of the Papal States amid an enthusiasm which knew no limit; all Italy sent forth a cheer of thankfulness that was echoed back from the Alps and the Apennines. About the sincerity of this joy, at least on the part of some, the Pope himself had serious misgivings, and there were persons who, from signs on the surface of society, saw beneath it the dark currents of treacherous thoughts and purposes. Occasionally conspiracy, as if taken by surprise, showed its hand; it applauded the generous efforts of the noble-hearted Pontiff, but always wanted more; from every office in the Papal States it would expel ecclesiastics, and would so pare down and hem in the powers of the Pope, as temporal ruler, that only the shadow of his authority would remain to him. In those dread days in Italy, with more than the savagery of the Iroquois, conspiracy marked out its victims for assassination; through the press it vilified the clergy, and rendered almost helpless the pontifical government in its labors for order and reform. Amid all this commotion in Rome Russia, Prussia, and Austria stood aloof. They felt probably that in their own homes there was trouble brewing; France, once again in the spirit of her old Catholic chivalry, was ready to send her army to the relief of the Holy Father,

but could not do so, partly through the disfavor of Austria, but principally through the decided opposition of Lord Palmerston. Just at this eventful crisis in Italian affairs Lord Minto was sent by the English cabinet into Italy to promote there the agitation for political reform. In the history of diplomacy no such mission had ever been heard of. Coming into the country as the accredited agent of the English government, he was heralded by the radical party as the champion of Italian independence. What his special powers were men did not care to inquire; they knew only that he came to promote reform, and this they interpreted according to their own cherished views and national aspirations. Wherever he went,—to Turin, Milan, Florence, Rome, Naples, and Sicily,—riot either preceded or followed his arrival; and it became more and more apparent that the Italian movement aimed not merely at the reformation, but also at the destruction of the governments of the peninsula. The mission of Lord Minto was, to say the least of it, a shameful breach of international comity, and "proved in its results," says Mr. Alison, "most calamitous, and is to be regarded as one of the main causes of the revolution which soon after broke out in the Italian peninsula."[1]

On the representation of the other great European powers Lord Palmerston wrote to the diplomatic agents of Great Britain in Turin, Naples, and Florence, to cease agitating, but it was too late; the evil had been done, and the political passions that had been stirred to their depths, now lashed into fury, swept with the impetuosity of a torrent over the fields and towns of Italy. At the same time nearly all the governments of Europe were undermined by the "secret societies," and, in 1848, the year of revolutions, when the train was fired, European thrones either fell or tottered. Louis Philippe lost the French throne. Charles Albert, of Sardinia, had to lay down his crown, in 1849, at the feet of Austria, the King of Prussia had to salute the flag of the revolution, the Emperor of Austria abdicated in favor of Francis Joseph, all the Italian states had to change their constitutions to suit the revolutionary party, while the Pope had to seek refuge in Gaeta from the rebellion and anarchy of Rome.

The passage in Italian history which I have just barely sketched (and it is only of Italian history that I speak directly), reveals some few points that bear on our subject. We see in it that European statesmanship was drifting to a withdrawing of itself more and more from the influences and principles of Christianity, as well as from the conscientious discharge of the duties of political life according to the plain dictates of justice. There were statesmen who maintained that the Christian European State, the crea-

[1] History of Europe, vol. viii., p. 209.

tion of the Church, should be secularized; or, again, that expediency, whether for right or wrong, was the rule of political action. They seemed to think that politics was a department of public life from which morality was sublimated—a sort of no man's land, in which politicians might riot as they pleased without fear of colliding with the right of the neighbor, or of injuring his property. To them selfishness or utilitarianism seemed to be the legitimate ground of political action. They professed to be conscientious, and this they were after their own fashion. They had one conscience for private or domestic interests, and this, as being the voice of right within them, they seemed to listen to, but, for dealing with foreign nations, or with public business, or with political rivals, they appeared to have quite another—and this one was the voice of national selfishness or dislike—a kind of mental intrigue or warp of the mind, trained to gain its end by all the crooked ways of flattery or deceit. It is hard to conceive how they defined a political act after having taken out of it that which gives it an ethical character. They would not admit that politics are the morals of public life, or that they can be made the subject-matter of duty, and would resent, as impertinent, any protest on the part of priest or bishop in regard to political measures which were palpably unjust. Now, I do not say that European statesmen laid down these views in definite words, but they drew them out in actions by violating rights, and by invading the spiritual domain of the Church. She had to contend with two enemies, conspirators from within Italy, and diplomatists from without it, and both leagued to thwart her teaching, and, if possible, to destroy her power. The agitation which was carried on hindered her undoubtedly from fulfilling her mission with the completeness with which she desired, but, as a rule, that agitation did not materially affect the religion of the people. In cities and towns, particularly, the population was swayed by an unwonted fervor for independence, but, while they sought after the new liberty, they remained, and wished always to remain, the faithful children of the Church. In no other Italian state, perhaps, was the strain on the faith of the people so great, and so continuous, as on that of the people of Tuscany, and yet of them, in 1856, Mr. Mabel S. Crawford writes, in his *Life in Tuscany:* "It is only due to truth to say, that from what fell under my observation during a ten months' residence, it seemed to me that even the warmest opponents of the Church of Rome could not, in fairness, but admit that, far from being a mouldering fragment of the past, the Church, though old, is still a vigorous, living plant, well-rooted in the hearts of the great bulk of the population of that country."

Through that widespread political agitation there were surely some whose moral rectitude was interfered with, and others, and

these the conspirators against social order, who, having practically renounced the faith, entertained the deadliest hatred of the Church. These were the men who kindled and kept alive the furnace-fires of the revolution. Comparatively few, by their writings and talk, as well as by the excitement which they caused, and the outrages which they committed, they made the world suppose that they were the majority of the nation. And at that time, and since, persons looking on from without began to ask, "How comes it that this Catholic Italian people is alienated from the Church?" In the physical world a violent storm will set all the elements in commotion, it will darken the air, cloud the heavens, make the sea rage, it will thrill all nature, and far beyond its march through the universe, by its pressure, will extend the influence of its fury; much after the same way, in the social world, a revolution or a violent political agitation, got up by a political party, will put in commotion, as history teaches, all the social elements; it will draw to itself the attention of all; will excite passion, appeal to the sense of right, weld together the wills of millions, and by that tremendous power strive to gain its end. In attaining a just end by just means this agitation is, perhaps, the strongest of forces; in striving for an unjust end by means no matter of what nature, it is powerful, indeed, but transitory. In 1848 the revolution shook all Europe, as if by a volcano, and from the confusion that ensued it seemed to some observers as if the populations had abandoned the Church and the State alike; but the revolution quickly burned itself out, for the time, within its own crater, and things came back pretty much to their old grooves, and Italian rulers came back to their thrones.

In Italy the Church had now to contend with her old enemies, and these strengthened by new auxiliaries. The secret societies had been frustrated in their aims, but were not vanquished. Quickly they set to plot anew; now, however, they could shelter themselves near the throne of Victor Emmanuel, King of Piedmont, and were at home with Louis Napoleon, who had graduated among them, and whose "first enemies," said the London *Times*, "were the *sbirri* of Leo XII. and the Austrian police." Before his election to the presidency of the French republic, to please the French infidels, he condemned the expedition to Rome for the relief of the Pope as "a dangerous religious demonstration," and the day after, on the very eve of his election, he wrote to the Papal nuncio at Paris, "that the maintenance of the temporal sovereignty of the venerable head of the Church is intimately connected with the splendor of the Catholic religion, as well as with the freedom and independence of Italy." When he became President he showed his colors, and wrote thus, officially, to one of his deputies in

Rome: "It is thus I epitomize the temporal government of the Pope: General amnesty, the secularization of the administration, the Code Napoléon, and a liberal government." To his diplomatic agent to the republicans of Rome he gave one kind of instruction, and quite the very contrary to his ambassador to Pius IX. at Gaeta. This was the man of double mind, and with a conscience made to order, who was emperor of France for nearly twenty years, and during that time was at the bottom of intrigue and discord in Italy.

Victor Emmanuel, leagued with the "sects," was not so astute as his imperial cousin of France, but was less shameless in his conduct. He stated plainly his line of policy, and though this was often disgraceful and unjust, it was, at least, something for the Church to know that she had an open foe. But behind the throne of Piedmont there was one who did for its king his thinking, and by deliberate, scientific intrigue was to him much what Machiavelli might have been to Lorenzo de' Medici. This was Camillus Benso, Count de Cavour. "He was," writes M. A. Lacroix, in his work, *Le Dernier des Napoléons*, "the greatest minister and the most detestable character which Europe had produced since Talleyrand. Journalist, exile, conspirator, Cavour had been at Paris studying the means by which Piedmont might absorb all the states of the Peninsula. . . . . He saw at a glance the situation of Europe; he perceived that the time had come when *ruse* or treachery could give to the house of Savoy, by watching the opportunity, what centuries had not been able to accomplish for her. . . . . To secure the friendship of France for Piedmont, to drive kings and princes from Italy, under cover of aspirations for independence and nationality, and finally to confiscate the whole to the profit of the house of Savoy, such was the programme of the politician of Piedmont. . . . . He understood that, with such an ally as Napoleon, it was enough to promise, and then to bring on, through him and in spite of him, all the plan of Italian emancipation, but that it was necessary to be careful not to confide to him the secrets and developments of the plot, and only to use him to draw enough of blood and millions of money from France for driving Austria out of Italy. Treachery and corruption would deliver the rest of the Peninsula to Piedmontese covetousness." This programme was carried out to the letter. Not that it was written in so many paragraphs, and formulated by a bill in Parliament, but that it entered into the counsels of the successive cabinet ministers of Piedmont, and for thirty years and more underlay their policy. This corrupting of the political order by putting aside the laws of honesty and justice, by an Italian ruler, with the encouragement and aid of the Emperor of France and of English cabinet ministers, did not fail to

affect for evil the condition of Italian society. In other times, diplomacy sometimes covered much double-dealing, and, if you will, base hypocrisy, but, in the case we speak of, it was made to be the mask for the vilest plotting and bribery, and for the sowing of the seeds of rebellion among the populations of neighboring states. Ever since the battle of Novarra, Sardinia was smarting under her defeat by Austria. With the sword, and unaided, she would not dare face her again; but there were other weapons now at her command, with which she could retrieve her loss, and probably finally conquer. By lopping off a part of his original political plan Mazzini became the ally of Victor Emmanuel. Both were for the unity and independece of Italy; the latter, however, wished to be its king; the former aspired to see it a republic, and to be its first president; but this he would forego for the present, in order that their secret agents might, in concert, march into Lombardy and there strive to undermine the power of their common foe. The press was largely on their side; by every means, fair and foul, it tried to make out a strong case against Austria in Lombardy. The youth of cities and towns were taken with highflown views of liberty; riots ensued; the universities of Pavia and Padua were closed, and everybody seemed to feel that there was war in the atmosphere. But the sober-minded, those whose memories went back some years, could interpret the present agitation by what they had experienced in the past; the spell of liberty had been put upon them, and in its cause they saw committed crimes that would have disgraced savages, and sacrileges that only Mussulmans would have been guilty of. These remembrances disenchanted them, especially when they came to know that the new liberty meant stringent laws and more taxes.

On the 1st of January, 1859, as the diplomatic corps were presenting their respects to Napoleon in the Tuileries, turning, in dramatic fashion, after the style of his uncle, to Baron Hübner, the Austrian ambassador, he said to him, "I regret that my relations with your government are not as good as they were." These words, immediately telegraphed to every European court, rang out through the world as a tocsin of war. In the crisis the English conservative ministry, under Lord Derby, endeavored to mediate between Austria and Piedmont, and pressed Count Cavour to adopt a peace policy. Just at the time that he hoped to capture his prey, it was irritating to him to have his spring thus broken by foreign interference. And as an English diplomatist one day plied him pretty hard on the subject, telling him that the public opinion of England was against him, he answered, "Very well; but my opinion is that, first of all, England is accountable for the troubles of Italy. English statesmen, English parliamentary speakers, Eng-

lish diplomatists and writers have been busy for years exciting political passions in this peninsula. Is it not England that urged Sardinia to counterbalance the unlawful preponderance of Austria by the propagation of moral influences ?" [1]

These are significant words. But England's mediation failed; Austria sent her ultimatum to Piedmont and was refused; Napoleon publicly proclaimed himself the ally of Victor Emmanuel, and the campaign began. Battle after battle in quick succession was a victory for the French and Piedmontese, until finally Austria, at Solferino, lowered her flag and acknowledged her defeat. The Austrian and French Emperors met at Villafranca, and Lombardy was annexed to the Kingdom of Piedmont.

But in the other central Italian states war had also raised its standard, under the direction of Garibaldi, a new ally of the King of Sardinia. His tactics, however, were not those of regular warfare; his part was to prepare the ground for a change of rulers, or to create "moral influences." In a document issued to the revolutionary circles and clubs of Italy just before the campaign began, he instructed his adherents how they were to get up rebellion; and, when it was successful, how they were to organize a military government in the name of Victor Emmanuel; and how the provisional commissary so appointed was to maintain "the severest and most inexorable discipline, applying to every person, no matter who he may be, the dispositions of military law in time of war." In this way Parma, Modena, and Tuscany were revolutionized and their legitimate rulers set aside by riot and violence. Some time after, the Kingdom of Naples went through the like revolutionary process, and that under the cover of British cannon and with the aid of the Piedmontese army. "The official orders of Cialdini (the commander of that army) and those of other Piedmontese generals, are worthy," said Nicotera in the Parliament of Turin, "of Tamerlane, of Gengis Khan, and of Attila." Open robbery, however, at the point of the bayonet was too shameless a thing in the face of the conservative governments of Europe, and would not be accepted by any decent man as grounds whereon to establish a government. But there were other means at hand, one particularly,—*the plébiscite*,—which some years before Napoleon had tried with good effect after he had shut up in prison his opponents, the leaders of the French Republic. On this occasion, in regard to Italy, he maintained the doctrine of non-intervention, and Lord John Russell, then a cabinet minister, in a speech at Aberdeen said that the Italian people must be let choose their rulers without molestation from any foreign nation. To prepare the people for

[1] From a sketch of the Life of Cavour, written by his intimate friend and cousin, Charles de Mazade. "La Revue des Deux Mondes," July 15th, 1876, p. 369.

voting recourse was had to those expedients which must secure success at all hazards. Many of the inhabitants of Piedmont emigrated freely for the time being into the neighboring states; wholesale bribery and fraud and intimidation were resorted to, and those who went to the booths to vote under the eyes of enemies felt that on their vote perhaps their lives hung. In all the states sweeping majorities were made out in favor of Victor Emmanuel; but what is strange in all this business is that, in Nice and Savoy, where Italian sentiment ran as high as in Naples, Savoy voted its annexation to France by one hundred and thirty-one thousand seven hundred and forty-four votes against two hundred and thirty-three. The fact is, that this apparent expression of the popular will was a farce got up to flatter public opinion. Two years before Cavour had stipulated with Napoleon, at Plombières, that when Piedmont, by the acquisition of Italian territory, would have a population of eleven millions, Nice and Savoy should be given over to France. To test the validity of this voting, however, there was no possibility of establishing an electoral court. But how reckless men had become at the time we may infer from the words of Lord Malmesbury, writing home from Tuscany to England: "I am not scrupulous in political matters," he wrote, "but indulgence has its limits. Bon Compagni, ambassador in Tuscany from the court of Turin, is, if not the head, at least one of the most active conspirators against the sovereign to whom he is accredited." Here is another passage from the *Journal* of M. d'Ideville, which gives us barely a glance at the plotting of the revolution at that time: "Sir James Hudson" (the English minister), he writes, "has been for many years at Turin. It was in his *salon* that, long before it happened, the Italian revolution was prepared. The exiles of Naples and Modena, in fact, all the persons most gravely compromised in political events, found in the house of the English minister a sure asylum, bountiful hospitality, and often even important subsidies. More than once he was in relation with Mazzini. On this subject one of the secretaries of the English legation, Lord Hubert de Burgh, used often to tell me, with a laugh: 'I have just been dining with Sir James. We were ten at table, and, except the minister and myself, all present were people sentenced to death. I still shudder at it.'"[1]

In the events just alluded to, there was certainly enough to corrupt the political life of Italy, and more than enough, were it not for the Church, to pervert the moral and religious sense of the people. Of the secular Italian governments that were then sup-

[1] "Journal d'un Diplomate en Italie. Notes intimes pour ressort a l'histoire du Second Empire (1859–1862)."

pressed I have no wish to be the apologist. Doubtless there were many features in them which would not suit republican views. But no charge of tyranny or of undue severity or of excessive taxation was clearly proved against them at the time; they had even entered on the way of constitutional reform, in accordance with the wishes of their peoples. The Church, even had she recalled the past, and had she not the spirit of mercy and forgiveness, would have no reason to compassionate the fate of those governments nor the very stock—Bourbon or Hapsburg—from which they had sprung. But for having suffered one wrong she could not sanction another. They were legitimate governments, and their rulers had lawful authority. To deprive them of this, no matter on what plea, was a gross violation of right and of the principles of civilized legislation. But the maxim had gone abroad, through pamphlets attributed to Napoleon, that nationality should be set against treaties, and that mere greatness is better than goodness, or that the grandeur of a state is to be measured solely by the number of its acres. After Austria gave up Venice and the Quadrilateral, Italy, save the Papal States, came under the sceptre of Victor Emmanuel. "Italy was made," as the phrase ran, "but was not completed," and for the future was to take her place among the great nations of the world. This was the enthusiastic hope of Italians. They did not care to examine how far this hope was grounded, out of what materials they had made their nation, or whether there were in it those elements that promise national stability.

To every observer, however, it was evident that neither in its foundation nor in any of its parts was there either right or justice. And right, as they might have learned from Cicero,[1] is the cement of a state. It is its great bond of union, its life-blood. It is the root of its growth, the very soul that quickens every part of the body politic; and, when a strain is put upon it, that fires the national heart with the principles of lofty patriotism. Since its very beginning there has been a blight on the Italian government. "The list of its ministers since Cavour's death is a little limbo of ruined reputations." It crossed swords once with Austria, and was shamefully beaten. It protested against the doings of the French in Africa, but dared not speak loud enough. It has been going begging through the world to save itself from bankruptcy; and, apostate as it is, though it is often called Catholic, it has acted towards the Church in the spirit of an apostate. It is brave only towards the powerless; it has turned out on the world thousands of poor, helpless religious women, and has appropriated their prop-

[1] In his work, "De Officiis," he thus defines a state: "Cœtus hominum jure sociatus."

erty. What any humane government of the past never did it has done. It has stripped the minister of the altar of his sacerdotal robes and forced him to put on the uniform of a private soldier. It has exiled or imprisoned brave bishops who stood up for the rights of the Church, has confiscated her possessions, and has closed the schools against her. Nay, it has tried to undermine the faith of youth, to corrupt the clergy, and to create rebellion in the Church. How comes this to pass? One may say, What has brought the government of a civilized country to stoop so low? The history of our times answers, the plotting and spirit of "the secret sects," which is also the spirit of the Italian government, and the persuasion and encouragement of foreign anti-Catholic statesmen.

"Italy was made but was not completed." In the way of the Piedmontese government stood another independent power in Italy, the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. With this were blended certain features which it was hazardous to deal with. It had a title-deed the most ancient and the most authentic of any royal house of Europe. It arose in the very twilight of Christian ages, not from conquest, nor from the violation of any right, but by the force of circumstances and from the spontaneous generosity of the faithful. Like the plant, it was the growth of nature. Its first fibre scholars have endeavored to find down through the age of Constantine and beyond it, but it has baffled their researches; about its very first origin there seem to lie mysteries analogous to those that lie at the root of every natural product. The power of all other temporal rulers has its own special end; the temporal power of the Pope has the same, but it is moreover to be a shield for the perfect freedom of the exercise of another and a higher power. The sovereignty of others has come through the ordinary laws ordained of God in the social order, the temporal sovereignty of the Pope has been ruled by special dispositions of divine Providence. Sovereignty has come to monarchs often as an inheritance, it has come to the Popes as a trust for the benefit of the Catholic world. The right of monarchs to temporal rule has frequently become extinct, being swallowed up, as it were, by social changes through time in its onward march,—the right of the Popes as temporal rulers has never died. It has often, indeed, been in abeyance; time and again Popes have been imprisoned or driven into exile, and their territories seized by hostile powers; even in this century Pius VII. had been detained a prisoner at Savona and Fontainebleau, by Napoleon I., and Pius IX. had to fly his capital, in order to evade the threats and horrors of the followers of Mazzini; but no matter when violated and how long, this right, by the shaping of events under special providential laws, swung back in the course of time to its normal rule. In the physical world scientists infer that

such or such is a law of nature from the recurrence and uniformity of phenomena; Newton deduced the law of gravitation from the observation of falling bodies; with at least an equal force of reasoning the maintenance and restoration of the Pope's temporal sovereignty during fifteen centuries, in spite of all disturbing elements, furnish us with the law of its existence and the necessity of its continuance in the social world. For this sovereignty Italian statesmen have undertaken to find a substitute, to give guarantees for the Pope's independence and freedom, and thus to put in place of an order of divine Providence an expedient of their own making. The fact of their having done so shows that even they recognized the necessity of having the exercise of his sublime powers by the chief pastor of the Church guarded from all external pressure on the part of individuals or nations. But do these guarantees suffice for the Pope's freedom?

The Pope, indeed, has no gaoler at his door and no hostile guard in his palace; he is even styled King, although the attributes of royalty have been taken from him; a sceptre is put into his hand, and not a subject is left him to rule over. He is face to face with a hostile power, nay, he is under it, as he himself has stated; that power is a standing menace to him. Around his palace he is vilified by the public press; his high prerogatives as supreme pastor of the Church are ridiculed, the teaching of Catholic truth decried, while the clergy and sacred rites are caricatured in shop-prints and on the stage. What treatment he receives from his enemies the Holy Father himself has told us in an address to Italian pilgrims, October, 1881. "Remember always," said he, "that the supreme pastor of your souls is in the midst of enemies, in whom the power of rage and hatred can reach such an extreme as Rome beheld with horror on that forever ill-omened night when she was accompanying with pious duty to the grave the remains of our venerated predecessor. *Remember that the person and divine authority of the Pontiff are day by day thrown into the mud by the work of an unbridled press, which casts at him outrages and insults by the handful.*" These are words to be remembered not only by Italian Catholics but by Catholics of every nation of the world. They tell us that moral restrictions often curtail the freedom of a sovereign as efficiently as the bars of a prison. Alexander of Russia, through the plotting of the Nihilists, is to-day as helplessly a captive as if he were confined to his winter palace under a hostile guard, and the common Father of the faithful is pilloried in the Vatican, the whole Catholic world looking on. "It is folly to suppose," said Pope Leo, last March, to the Cardinals, "that the Catholics of the world will resign themselves to suffer peacefully their chief and their master to remain long

in a condition so incompatible with his dignity and so trying to their own filial love."

In the crisis the apparent apathy of Catholic peoples seems the more striking when one considers that they have even to tax themselves in order to support the dignity and to supply the wants of the Holy See. They have seen themselves despoiled of the States of the Church, their common patrimony, by their Catholic ancestors given in trust to the Popes for the support of religion; and now, forsooth, they have to bear the burden of this iniquity, to pay money because miscreants, and conspirators, and a king with a robber's title have seized on Rome and the papal provinces. The question is not only one of religion and justice, but also of international finance. It is a question, indeed, which the diplomacy of this age would not readily deal with, but one for the solution of which the Pope, as we have seen, relies on the devotedness and efforts of the whole Catholic body. The moral force of public opinion set in motion by legal agitation unbarred a Parliament closed against Catholics for centuries; were that force increased a hundredfold, it would shatter to pieces any institution based on injustice and on the violation of the sacred rights of millions of people. Or, in other terms, were the hundreds of millions of Catholics through the globe to demand in thunder tones that freedom and independence be granted to their Supreme Pastor, King Humbert would probably do quickly what, it is said, he intends to do finally,—he would leave Rome. The ages of Catholic chivalry are not past, although, indeed, the crowned leaders of Catholic chivalry are dead. Diplomacy in our times has in some countries tied down, and anti-Christian legislation seems well-nigh to have paralyzed, the organized coöperation of Catholics for the Catholic cause; but should their generous impulses have a vent given to them, or should Catholic peoples see clearly their way for redressing the great wrong put on them, it would be soon known that the Catholic heart throbs as strongly and as lovingly as ever for the freedom and rights of the successor of St. Peter.

Indeed, the present position of the Holy Father has, as it were, set the Church ajar, but the manner in which this has been brought about by an influential faction has been well calculated to injure faith and morals in Italy. In all those Italian political movements the revolutionary or apostate party has had two ends in view: the first, to make Italy one; the second, to destroy, if possible, the papacy. To accomplish this double purpose they united all their efforts to sow disaffection among the population of the Papal States, to censure the Pope's government, to misrepresent Catholic doctrine, and to corrupt by the most odious means the faith and morals of the people. In 1860 this party had overturned the papal government in the Romagna and the Marches, and spread everywhere

the seeds of disloyalty to the Pope and to the Church, with the secret approval of Victor Emmanuel and Napoleon. What villainous means were then used to establish this great Italian nationality by the riffraff of Italian towns and by the scum of some European countries we learn from the indignant protest of the bishops of the Marches addressed to the Piedmontese military governor: "We scarcely believe our own eyes or the testimony of our own hearing," they write, "when we see and learn the excesses, the abominations, the disorders, enacted in the principal cities of our respective dioceses, to the shame and horror of the inhabitants, to the great detriment of religion, of decency, and of public morality, since the ordinances against which we protest prevent us from protecting religion and morality, or from inveighing against the prevailing crimes and licentiousness."

The papal subjects as a rule stood loyally by their sovereign, and to aid the papal troops armed themselves in his defence, but were overpowered by superior numbers. Public, unprovoked spoliation of the territory of the oldest sovereignty in Europe was carried on in the face of the civilized world, and Prussia and Russia alone protested. Already in 1861 the Pope had lost some three-fourths of his subjects, while conspiracy was mining steadily the rest of his dominions, and Rome itself. In the midst of these circumstances, another move on the chess-board of politics was made by Napoleon and Victor Emmanuel. In September, 1864, "*a convention*" was entered into by them, the first article of which stated, "Italy binds herself not to attack the present territory of the Holy Father, and to prevent by force, if need be, all attacks on it from without." France bound herself to withdraw her troops gradually from Rome, and another provision sanctioned the forming of a Papal army. To honest men all this meant security for the Pope, but to cunning Piedmontese statesmen it was only so much language in order to conceal their thoughts. The ink of that treaty was not dry before Nigra, the Italian plenipotentiary, who was a party to it, wrote that it "was not intended to mar the national aspirations." Bands of conspirators forthwith swarmed into the Papal provinces, and into Rome, to join this movement, the soldiers of the Piedmontese army deserted with the connivance of their officers, the loyalty of the Pope's subjects was tampered with, but generally in vain, and the grossest calumnies circulated against the clergy and the Pope's administration. The Italian government had removed from Turin to Florence, and Ratazzi was at this time prime minister.

". . . . Politician,
With more heads than a beast in a vision,"[1]

[1] Hudibras.

he could be devoted to the Pope, seemingly frank in his policy with Napoleon, and chuckle over all that as he hatched conspiracy with his associates. Garibaldi, in buckram and red shirt, was the hero of the act that was just then on the political stage. So formidable had he become that, like Napoleon I., he had to be bound to an island. He had broken loose, however, but, as it appeared, for stage effect, for Crispi, a revolutionary leader, had telegraphed to Ratazzi, "All is ready; let loose Garibaldi." And when he was loose, in order to throw dust in the eyes of Napoleon, an attempt must be made to capture him; so Ratazzi telegraphs to the Prefect of Perugia, "Pursue Garibaldi, but so as not to overtake him, and burn this telegram,—Urbano Ratazzi." Fortunately the telegram was not burned; it remains as a sample of the high-toned diplomacy of the court of Florence. In France, Napoleon III. was in a difficult plight. From the Florentine statesman he heard that the tide of revolutionary passion was rising higher and higher among the inhabitants of the Pope's dominions; on the other hand, he heard of the true state of things from Cardinal Antonelli, the papal secretary of state. At home he could notice the rumbling of a threatening storm; the French nation was fairly aroused, the old Gallic chivalry was refurbishing its arms in view of the coming fight, and the French Parliament, led by the great orator, Thiers, spoke in tones which forced the wily imperial policy to uncoil itself. A French fleet, with French troops on board, was ordered to leave Toulon for Civita Vecchia. By the revolutionary leaders it had been arranged that a general attack was to be made on the 22d of October, 1867. The French army embarked on the 18th, and was twice countermanded by Napoleon, so that it was only on the 26th the fleet could set sail. This certainly looked like treason, and that it really was so became a common opinion.[1] Meanwhile, in the Pope's domain, the Pontifical Zouaves were scoring victory after victory over their enemies, until finally, in the battle of Mentana, with the support of the French, they gave them the *coup de grace*. The wave of the revolutionary movement was for the time broken, the people of the Papal States, content with their sovereign, could take some rest. But within a year the European firmament was ablaze with war, and the revolution, without hindrance, could stalk forth from its dens, and the government of Florence, now emancipated from the fear of France, could show its hand. The obligation of a solemn international pact, the sense of justice, or of religion, or of decency, did not stand in the way of

[1] Twitting General della Marmora, shortly after, with his failure in taking Rome, Napoleon III. said: "You are a set of 'imbeciles.' *I gave you eight days* to do your work, and you did nothing."

that government, and the army of Victor Emmanuel, reinforced by Garibaldian freebooters, following the code of Italian banditti, on the 20th of September, 1870, took possession of Rome. A few days after, the vote of the Roman people was taken, armed men guarding the booths, and when the vote was counted by the conquerors themselves, only forty-six were found to side with the Pope. People had reason to be dissatisfied with this expression of the popular will, and hence, the year following, a vote was taken by the Romans themselves, and then 27,700 declared for the Pope.

Never since the fall of the lower empire had national honor been so outraged as by this violation of sovereign rights and by this high-handed plunder of national property. A breach of public faith, in the eyes of the monarchs of Italy and France, was a trifle, and the plighted word, that would hold to itself the soul of the savage, could not hold the Christian monarchs to the fulfilment of duty. The Pope's estate and capital had, indeed, often before been invaded and seized; this, however, was done by declared enemies in undisguised defiance of all right. But here are two crowned sovereigns acting their mean part, like expert swindlers, in order by sharp practice to rob their brother sovereign. The crying injustice that was in it fills the upright heart with indignation, but the meanness, in which that injustice was set, provokes in all honorable souls a sense of disgust. All this, be it remembered, was done in open day, in sight of Catholic Christendom; and the eldest son of the Church, and the most Christian king, and their apostolic and Catholic majesties had nothing to say,—would do nothing. The world of right had gone backward; justice had retrograded. In 1815 the sovereigns of Europe, with one accord, restored Pius VII. to his possessions; in 1849 the French republic reseated Pius IX. on his throne; in 1867 the French nation, in spite of its emperor, caused French cannon to thunder at Mentana, but in 1870 not a sovereign in Europe was found to raise a finger in order to give to the Pope right and liberty. As the great Pius, in the midst of his woes, expressed it: "The poor old Pope is now bereft of all earthly aid. Relief can only come from above."

"The Church since then is more than ever before under captivity in Italy. Her property has been again confiscated; her religious orders driven from their homes; civil marriage has been legalized, her liberty restricted, and a share in the education of youth denied her. While the nation is deluged with irreligious and immoral literature, recent acts of rebellion and mob-violence are justified and defended; truth is kept back or distorted; the Church and the Sovereign Pontiff are the daily object of revilings and accusa-

tions; and no opinion is too absurd or too pernicious to be scattered broadcast over the world"[1]

What the Church suffers to-day in Italy is the consummation, as we have seen, of what she has had to suffer there during this century. It is not denied that under the pressure of irreligion, and in contact with it, some Italians have fallen, but the Italian people, as such, have preserved through the struggle their Christian faith and morals. In an address read to Pius IX. in 1867, on behalf of the hundred Italian cities, the Count of Modena made his own the saying of a revolutionary leader, to wit: "that the masses of the Italian people are for you and your authority." "Our government," said, a few months ago, the deputy Sonnino Sidney in the Italian Parliament, "is feeble—and I am not speaking of this or that ministry but of the government itself—and thus fulfils its mission badly; it is weak, because our political life has become quite superficial. The overwhelming majority of the population, more than 90 per cent. of it, feels itself a stranger to our institutions; it beholds itself subject to the state, and forced to serve it with blood and with money, but it does not feel that it constitutes a living and organic part of it, and takes no interest in its existence or development." What those grand "national aspirations" have come to, Italian populations have learned to their cost. "Carefully prepared statistics," says a writer in the *North American Review*, "submitted by Senator Pepoli to the Italian senate, in 1879, show that 19½ per cent. of the income of the government is derived from such prime necessities as breadstuffs, meat, and salt, and that nearly one-quarter of the revenue was so levied as to be unduly oppressive to the poor." . . . The ancient city of Venice, once the great mart of the world, has now a population of 140,000, of whom 36,000 are paupers. "The Italian peasants flee from enormous taxes, as those of Germany do from military service," and the writer remarks, "Italy sends abroad emigrants, as industrious, patient, and saving, as any peasantry in Europe."

"Of the population of 26,000,000 Italians," wrote Cardinal Manning, some years ago, "not 3,000,000 have launched themselves in the revolution of the last twenty years. The great bulk of the people are, as they have always been, Christian, Catholic, and loyal." . . . "In my judgment, and I have formed it, not in London from newspaper correspondents, but in Rome during many a long residence, extending in all over seven years, those who have encouraged this chronic agitation against the religion of Italians and the independence of Rome, have been among the chief causes of the present disorder in Italy." As a confirmation of this great testimony, it was only the other day that Pope Leo wrote in one of

[1] Encycl. to the Bishops of Italy.

his splendid letters: "The large majority of Italians are still earnest Catholics."

NOTE.—Irreligion has entered Italy mainly through political agitation; it entered France principally through anti-Christian and philosophical doctrines. The intercourse between France and England, the works of English Deists translated for French readers, the influence of some English freethinkers on the highest circles of French society, made the French mind acquainted with many features of infidelity as it prevailed in England in the beginning of the eighteenth century. French apologists of Christianity, according to Beurier, complained of the number of infidel books that were imported into their country from England. There is no argument, even the most reckless, of French philosophy in the eighteenth century, Villemain maintains, that is not found in the English school at the beginning of the same age. Lecky tells us that "it was from the writings of Locke and Bacon that Voltaire and his followers drew the principles that shattered the proudest ecclesiastical fabrics of Europe," and in his *Life of Bacon* the German, Fischer, writes: "As Hobbes and Locke have their root in Bacon, so the French philosophy of the eighteenth century had its root in Locke, being related to the English philosophy as a colony to the mother country." These statements are admitted by a writer in the *Saturday Review*, September 12th, 1874, in a notice of Lange's *History of Materialism:* "Strange as the fact may seem to some," he says, "England was the hotbed whence sprang the infidelity that spread over France during the years immediately preceding the first revolution, though it attained new forms in a new atmosphere, and especially in the case of Le Mettrie assumed a tone of indecency unknown to its native home."

Holland had also its share in propagating infidelity in the last century; it was from her printing-presses those infidel works went forth which were retailed through neighboring nations; it was there that Bayle published his dictionary, and that Spinosa, himself a Dutchman, devised his monstrous system of Pantheism.

Switzerland was as active as Holland in this propagandism of error. In 1763 Voltaire wrote to D'Alembert: "In Calvin's own town there are only a few, shabby, beggarly fellows, who believe in Christ," and elsewhere, "England and Switzerland are overrun with men who hate and despise Christianity, like Julian himself."

Jean Jacques Rousseau, a Calvinist, hailed from Geneva.

The same causes that have been at the bottom of Italy's troubles in this century have also been at work in Spain. She, too, has been under the grudging policy of the House of Bourbon. Infidel and immoral literature has been introduced among her

people. False ideas on religion and government were brought to her by foreign armies; and secret societies, under the protection of foreign powers, have been trying to destroy her religion and conservative institutions. Her political life is kept in agitation by a bold faction, but, as all travellers tell us, her people are still Catholic to the core.

THE INFLUENCE OF ST. FRANCIS OF ASSISI ON MEDIÆVAL ART.

"We owe to the mind of St. Francis that inspiration, nobler than human, which stirred the emulation of the greatest artists."—LEO P. P. XIII., Encycl., 17 Sept., 1882.

AT times convictions take possession of a human soul and develop therein with such astonishing power over and beyond all that surrounds it, assuming dimensions in their ultimate results which are out of all proportion with the source whence they appear to spring, that we are forced to look for their reason in some design of Providence bearing testimony to the unfailing truth on which they rest, and giving assurance of their predestined accomplishment. The Catholic Church is the soil on which such souls ordinarily grow. The fact of Calvary, of all human failures in an earthly point of view the most complete, yet with its prodigious effects, unaccountable unless in the light of a higher principle, has established a norm by which we may measure like phenomena.

When St. Francis of Assisi suddenly departed from the common course of men about him, those who loved him best mourned, because, as they said, the beautiful youth had grown mad. But he had turned to follow a master, whom with less reason the enlightened world of old Rome had pointed out as a fool; and so he went on securely in his way, "ce fou sublime, dont la folie confondit la sagesse du monde." And when the few short years of his earthly life had come to their end, he had set into motion and given a lasting impulse to a revolution, which in due time overturned the political, social, and religious world from its existing state. Like the sun, which he affectionately calls his brother, and to which Dante aptly compares him, he, "when not yet much distant from his rising, began to bless the earth by his good influence."[1] He illumined

[1] Paradise, Cant. XI., 53.

the darkness into which the world of those days was deeply merged, and created a new growth upon its face, breathing by the genial warmth of his spirit fresh life into the decaying members of society. Popes, emperors, nay, the obstinate princes of the East, who hated with a natural and religious hatred alike whatever bore the Christian name, bowed to his will and vied with one another in showering favors upon him to whom nothing was dearer than the contempt and poverty of Christ. Even St. Dominic, if we may believe the annalist of a past day,[1] intimate and familiar friend of our saint, seemed for a moment to have lost confidence in his own distinct and stupendous mission, when he came within the circle of that radiant fire of seraphic love.

But it is not our purpose to measure the influence of St. Francis upon his own or later times except in so far as it caused the revival of the fine arts, which in point of time and place assumes definite form immediately after the death and at the tomb of the Saint. It were strange indeed if we could not trace the cause of this sudden change in the sphere of taste to the direct influence of him who from that time forth appeared for several generations at once the devout object and the patron of the fine arts. And no doubt it will be well to recall to mind the means which served to raise so admirable a structure as that which the school of Christian art presents to us in the 13th century, at a time when at least the outward conditions of society are much the same as they were then, with perhaps this difference in our favor, of a far more eager search after a high standard of taste.

In order to estimate correctly the influence of St. Francis upon the life of the fine arts for several centuries after his death, it will be necessary to cast a brief glance upon the character of the man who, by the sole force of his personal endowments, without any assistance from without, was able to produce such gigantic effects. We shall next consider this influence in its further results.

I.

The most superficial reader of the life of St. Francis will be impressed with two features in the singular career of the Monk of Assisi: that peculiar asceticism, from which, as we know, arose the mystic school of thought, whose best exponent in theology became St. Bonaventure, and which found its truest illustration in the whole range of Christian schools of art, beginning in faint outlines with Giunta Pisano, the friend of St. Francis, and ending, at least for a considerable time, with Raphael, in his earlier works. The other trait, which aside from this strikes us, is the intense love of and sympathy with nature manifested by the Saint on every occasion.

[1] Vita S. Francisci, Bolland.

Nature was, so to speak, poverty, whom he had chosen as his bride, in her fairest apparel. When he had relinquished all for Christ, he had gained all; the whole great world was now his own, and he felt this possession, and it made him happy beyond earthly happiness.

One day, before he had made his choice, when he was returning from a festival, his companions, seeing him strangely pensive and tarrying behind, asked him laughingly what could absorb the light-hearted Giovanni so profoundly at this time. "I was thinking," said he, "of taking a spouse, but one so noble, so beautiful, that I know none like her on earth." From that day the fair young Bernadone changed. "He is lovesick," they said, and so he was. He had seen a glimpse of some beautiful being, a quick vision of some magnificent reality, and his heart went out to it; went out to God, that Beauty everlasting and surpassing all His creatures. And the Saint loved only the more these creatures, now that he recognized them as love-tokens of God's munificent affection towards his humble spouse. He would cast aside the gilded deckings and don the wedding garment to please but his new choice. So by vigils and fasts, terrific stripes and crucifixions of his tender flesh, he called to heaven for a spotless robe, until the folly of a thoughtless boyhood had been wholly wiped out.

As sin disappears in man, its consequences vanish one after another, or lose their hold on him, and the former state of sinless happiness returns. In Paradise all nature had been subject to Adam. But once he rebelled against his Maker, creation declared enmity to its former master, man. Henceforth his life was one continued toil, and sorrow became as his daily companion. Then, as he bore the burden meekly, it lightened, or perhaps his strength increased, and he felt less of the old crushing weight. Nature grew more kind, the ground yielded more readily to the pressure of his spade, and it brought forth fruit and flower, which lighted up once more his aged care-worn features, and labor, duty, sacrifice, became a consolation. And when the end came they brought to the saintly patriarch the last born of his grandchildren that he might bless it. But he looked strangely out into the open field where stood the tree which he had planted, a twig of Eden's sad tree of life. And in prophetic vision he discerned the fruit that was one day to grow thereon—*arbor decora et fulgida!* And he saw how the curse which he had brought upon his progeny was to depart by the strength of that fruit. It was a rapturous thought, and he loved the tree for its destiny, and the birds that nestled in it, and the flowers that grew beneath its shade; he loved all nature, for he saw in it expressed the ineffable love of his Maker. Then his dying hand blessed the babe with the strength of the expected Redeemer, and when with his last look he gazed into that blessed child's eyes he

saw there the joy which he had seen in Eve before the fall, the joy of innocence, like to no other joy on earth. How often has that process been repeated in the penitents, saints of the Catholic Church! It was in a manner the process which the soul of St. Francis experienced. He had become again a sinless child, in the baptism of penance, in the strength of his Redeemer's Precious Blood. Nature spoke to him, and like a child he spoke to her, until both understood and loved each other as brother and sister of the same heavenly Father. See how it comes out, this love, in all its virginal freshness and innocence as we meet him in the by-ways around Assisi, sweetly caressing a rescued pair of turtle-doves: O sirocchie mie tortole, semplici, innocenti e caste—ora io vi voglio scampare da morte e farvi i nidi.[1] Or as we see him stooping to gather up the little worms from the road, lest they be crushed beneath the foot of some unthinking traveller; for he remembers how his Master had once said: I am a worm and not a man.

Such was his tender love for the works of God's hand, and like some magic spell it accompanied him wherever he journeyed, and where his shadow fell the ancient curse seemed forthwith to depart from the earth. The birds of the air, the beasts of the forest, came gladly at his call; the timid roe looked trustingly into that beautiful face and gathered its food from the hand that gave a blessing upon the dumb creature. All nature rejoiced when with him, and the lay "Laudate"[2] of the royal prophet seemed forever on his lips. Well could he write of "true and perfect joy,"[3] for it was always in his heart and round about him.

But this intense love of nature, this perfect harmony between his inner being and the rest of God's image in the outward creation, made St. Francis a poet, we might say an artist, in the truest sense of the word. Every artist is a poet. The history of the great masters amply illustrates this. We know how the genius of Giovanni Santi followed that of Petrarch and Dante, and how the father of the immortal Raphael was celebrated in his day alike for his verses and his paintings. Young Raphael himself was, as Lanzi informs us, a poet. Even Leonardo da Vinci, in spite of his practical turn of mind, has left us some verses. And most of the great painters of the early Italian school were enthusiastic students of Dante.

On the other hand, there exists a close and necessary connection between true art and Religion. Indeed art is a species of religion, in which man pays homage to the divine Beauty. Such was the idea of art even among the Greeks in its best days. When high ideals in religion are united to most perfect natural forms, whether

[1] My dear little sisters, sweet innocent doves,—yes, I am going to save you from death and build you little nests.

[2] 148 Ps. [3] De vera et perfecta laetitia—cited by Wadding.

expressed in harmony of sound, or in painting, or in sculpture, we have art in its truest sense.[1] The mystic school of art had its source in the realization of the highest ideal of divine love expressed in the purest types of nature. If we trace the origin of the two most characteristic fruits in the life of St. Francis, his asceticism and his love of nature, we shall find the one source an intense love, which made him identify everything about him with the motives of his Maker. This love terminates in a complete union with the divine will, and produces that harmony between the creature and his creator, identical in a manner with intuition, wherein the soul communes with God directly and faith yields to limited vision. No better argument than the fact of St. Francis can be brought against the assertion of Victor Cousin, that "he who pretends to commune with God in this mystic way, does thereby ignore Him in his manifestations in nature," and that such communication "is a dream and an incredible rashness."[2] Surely no one could have believed in God more essentially through "His manifestations in nature," whilst few saints were more closely united to Him, receiving, as he did, almost all the important commissions regarding the institute of his order, like Moses, directly from God. With St. Francis self no longer existed. It was merged in God. And when he looked upon nature he saw it, too, acting in harmony with that sublime sentiment of entire unselfishness, so beautifully expressed in the lines of a German poet:

O welcher reine heilge Edelmuth
In der Natur und rings im All,
Wo Eins dem Andern, und wo Alles Allen
Mitwirkung, Hilfe, alle seine Kraft
Und Liebe, selbst sein eignes schoenes Dasein
Herzinnig treu, mit stiller Freudigkeit
Dahingibt, ohne je daran zu denken
Ob auch ein Stäubchen nur dadurch bezahlt sei.

In reality this spirit has always done more, for art as even for abstract science, than did brush, or chisel, or toiling brain. The most devout painters have been more successful as Christian artists than those who possessed the secrets of perfect technique or the most accurate knowledge of anatomy. We know[3] how Cardinal di Lugo, that giant mind, went in his subtle perplexities of theology to consult the boyish novice John Berchmans, that God might re-

[1] Ruskin goes so far as to maintain that the realization of the divine presence in nature, and the love of nature which springs from and accompanies this consciousness are essential to and the only promise of true art.—Mod. Painters, vol. iii., p. 313.

[2] Vict. Cousin's Lect., Wright's translation, p. 103.

[3] Essay on the interest and characteristics of the Lives of the Saints, by F. W. Faber.

veal to the prayers of the saint the science withheld from his own comprehensive intellect. Hence, when we come to judge of the effect of this asceticism upon art, we must lay aside the rules of the connoisseur. "Mysticism," says Rio,[1] "is to painting what ecstasy is to psychology. It is necessary, in order to estimate it correctly, to associate ourselves by a strong and profound sympathy to certain religious ideas, with which this artist in his studio, or that monk in his cell have been more particularly preoccupied, and combine the results of this preoccupation with the corresponding sentiments in the minds of their fellow-citizens."

As St. Francis worshipped beauty because it spoke to him of God, the eternal Beauty, reflected in nature, so he found himself drawn to rival nature, or to seek its choicest types, and to beautify, by his own hand, whatever was, in an especial manner, to image forth that heavenly splendor, or to enhance its appreciation among men.

The habitations of his monks were to be severely simple. "*Habentes quibus tegamur his contenti sumus*," he said, with the apostle. We remember how, on one occasion, he became all aglow with holy indignation when, on one of his visitations, he found that the monks had, with much labor, built a magnificent convent; and how it took all the influence of Cardinal Hugolino, the then protector of the order, to pacify him. "*Nostram hanc domum non agnosco*," he called out, "*neque meos fratres reputo qui in illa permanserint.*"[2] But when he reared altars and temples to the Most High, his zeal for their adornment knew no limit. He wanted to be poor, and no other saint in the Church has so entirely made that title of *il povero di Dio* his own. His patrimony he gave for the restoration of a church. Long before he had laid the foundation of the order of Friars Minors, he had devoted himself entirely to the reconstructing and beautifying of the house of God. He went from door to door begging alms, crying aloud in the market-place: "Come, help me to build the Church of St. Damian." It was a passion with him, and people wondered what he meant. Yet he went on restoring. Church after church arose, newly adorned; St. Damian, St. Peter Apostle, and the Portiuncula, in his native city of Assisi. Cardinal Newman tells us somewhere that it was architecture which directed the thoughts of one of the most zealous priests[3] he ever knew towards the Catholic faith. Well, it was architecture which, though in another way, led our Saint to the reform of the spiritual edifice that was swaying to and fro amidst many conflicting elements. When, prostrate before the crucifix in the church, he had first heard the voice of his Lord, bidding him rise and uphold his

[1] The Poetry of Christian Art. p. 122.

[2] Vita S. Francisci, Boll.

[3] The Rev. Hutchison, of the London Oratory.

tottering house, he applied the command as referring entirely to the material church. Yet God had meant it in another sense, and the saint was imperceptibly drifting towards the accomplishment of God's will by beginning his task in this way. With his own hands he set in order and embellished whatever about God's habitation was out of order, and when in after days he found a lovely spot, he would dedicate it to the special glory of the Most High, by raising there a chapel or an altar, or a niche in which to place the statue of some saint, so that it might remind the passing wanderer how good God is in giving us such beautiful things. In a lovely grove between Gemini and Porcaria he erected a church in honor of the Blessed Virgin, very like to the one of St. Maria de Angelis, in Portiuncula. We read, in his life, how, returning from Arezzo to Florence, he was compelled by sickness to stop a few days at Gangheretti. God had blessed the place by causing a fountain to spring up at the request of the languishing saint. As if to guard and beautify the spot where "God had been," he employed the brief time of his convalescence in building a wall about and adorning it.

Thus his love made him happy, for he was ever in full harmony with all that surrounded him. We said above that St. Francis was a poet. In point of time he is one of the first of Italian poets; no less in point of true and deep inspiration. "He burned, all on fire with love," says the author of the last life of St. Teresa,[1] "and that heavenly flame inspired simple but immortal verses." What he has left us of his unquestioned compositions shows that he was not neglectful of form. Poetry in all ages has had two principal sources, one secular, the other religious. Thus, at the time of St. Francis, the Provençal minnesinger sang in glowing words of his lady-love, and the Oriental element imported by the returning crusaders had done nothing to change the existing tendency towards the creation of a voluptuous literature. On the other hand, we find in Italy a healthy element of Christian poetry, asserting its sway from Dante down to Tasso, and beyond. And the sources of this stream, says Brockhoff,[2] we find in St. Francis and his disciples. A celebrated troubadour, whose real name has not come down to us, but who passed among the people as the "king of poets" (*rex versuum*), went one day, in frivolous mood, to hear the strange Assisian preach. Then he laid down his gold-and-purple-trimmed mantle, and begged the garb of a Franciscan monk from our saint. No longer did Brother Pacifico delight the princes in their banquet halls, or the people at high harvest-time; yet we cannot doubt that he sang for the monks, or that he taught St.

[1] Cited in the Civilta Cattolica, Quad. 774.
[2] Brockhoff, Die Kloester.

Francis to put into rhyme the hymns which the saint uttered in his wanderings, and which Brother Leo, who generally accompanied him, always noted down. St. Bonaventure tells us that amidst his frequent infirmities St. Francis often expressed a desire to hear music.[1] Wadding cites among his writings canticles in the vernacular and hymns for the use of the nuns of St. Clare. If we may judge from the few specimens yet remaining and accredited to him, they must have been exquisitely beautiful. There is a peculiar simplicity of style, a sweet flow of melody, in the Italian of that day. Anyone familiar with Latin will be able to enjoy the following prayer, which the saint is said to have used every day:

"O altissimo omnipotente glorioxo Idio,
Illumina le tenebre del core mio.
Doname te prego per tua gran bontade
Fede drita, speranza certa, con perfecta charitade.
E fame da mi havere perfecto cognoscimento
A ciò che sempre obserua el tuo sancto comandamento."[2]

"His canticum solis (*de lo frate sole*) is unquestionably," says Schlosser, in his translation of *I Cantici di S. Francesco*, "one of the finest productions of sacred poetry." The hymns *In foco amor mi mise*, and *Amor de caritade*, found in the works of St. Bernadine of Siena, are, by the weighty authority of Ireneo Affo, attributed to Fra Jacopone, the worthy forerunner of Dante. Yet they breathe all the spirit of St. Francis. Thus sang the Saint. Like a prophecy, reminding us of holy Simeon at once and Zachary, are the last words, the song of the dying swan, when prostrate on the ground, blind, and too weak to reach his beloved Assisi, he turns towards the cherished city with these prophetic words:

"Benedicta tu civitas a Domino
Quia per te multæ animæ salvabuntur
Et in te multi servi altissimi habitabunt
Et de te multi eligentur ad regnum aeternum.'[3]

How soon the blessing was verified. Less than forty years after, Assisi had sent out of her noviciate 200,000 monks, bearing the seeds of the spirit of St. Francis into every land on the globe.

---

[1] Ad jucunditatem spiritus excitandam alicujus audiendi soni harmoniaci desiderium habuisset. Vita S. Francisci.

[2] "O almighty, glorious God on high, enlighten the darkness of my heart. Grant me, I pray Thee, in Thy bounty, right faith, firm hope, and perfect charity. And let me plainly know myself, so that I may ever observe Thy holy laws."—This prayer appeared first in an ancient life of St. Clara, printed in Milan, 1492. It is not stated that St. Francis himself composed it, though there can hardly be a doubt of it.

[3] "Blessed art thou, O city, by the Lord, for through thee many souls shall be saved. In thee shall dwell many servants of the Most High, and out of thee many shall be chosen for eternal glory."

During his lifetime the saint had exercised great power over men. As Irnerius drew disciples around him by the fame of his learning, so St. Francis had attracted them by the rumor of his sanctity. Once they had seen him he kept them spellbound by his lovely ways. He was a beautiful man. His broad, chaste brow, and finely-chiselled features, his eyes, with their deep-dreamy joy, catching a spark whenever holy zeal prompted his heart to light them, the grace of his manner, and yet withal, his humble readiness to serve as beast of burden to the first that chose to claim such service,—all these things charmed the men that approached him, and they learned to love the things he loved, they hardly knew why; but there seemed to be so much superior wisdom and happiness in his choice. Now that he was dead, men wandered to his tomb. Assisi became the centre of inspiration, the fountain-head whence

> "Many rivulets have since been turned
> Over the garden Catholic to lead
> Their living waters, and have fed its plant."[1]

II.

> "Sanctitatis nova signa
> Prodierunt laude digna
> Mira valde et benigna
> In Francesco credita,"

sings Brother Thomas à Celano, in his sequence of the Saint. In truth, the effects of that sanctity were at once wonderful and new. Still in the bloom of manhood, according to years, when he left the scene of his activity, his mark was there indelibly. And its impress only deepened and intensified by the shock which his sudden summons to heaven created among those who had felt dependent on him. If there was one thing more pronounced than another, in this influence, it was the fact of a new tendency towards the love of the beautiful as it is in nature, and of its dedication by a unanimous impulse to the highest ends of man. St. Francis was, as we have seen, a poet, and his poetry pervaded, impersonated everything, so that the very atmosphere of Assisi seemed sufficient to create and nourish the inspiration of Christian art.

Let us hear the Protestant Milman on the subject, who yet fails in his attempt to explain the singular phenomenon of this influence:

> "Strange it might appear that the arts, the highest luxuries, if we may so speak, of religion, should be fostered, cultivated, cherished, and distributed by those who professed to reduce Christianity to more than its primitive simplicity, its nakedness of all

[1] Paradiso, Cant. xii., 96.

adornment, its poverty. Strange that these should become the most munificent patrons of art, the most consummate artists; that their cloistered palaces should be the most sumptuous in architecture, and the most richly decorated by sculpture and painting; at once the workshops and the abodes of those who executed most admirably. Assisi, the birthplace of St. Francis, the poor, self-denying wanderer over the face of the earth, who hardly owned the cord which girt him, who possessed not a breviary of his own, who worshipped in the barren mountains, whose companions were the outcasts of human society,—Assisi becomes the capital, the young, gorgeous capital of Christian art."[1]

He tells us, further on, that men who had an irresistible calling to be artists became Franciscans, because in that order they found those emotions which were to express themselves in art awakened, cherished, and strengthened. And no doubt, as the youth of Europe eager after science journeyed to Bologna, so that in a short time the two great bodies of the university, the Citramontani and the Ultramontani, counted among their hearers students from more than thirty different nationalities, so the youth that loved the arts came from afar to Assisi, there to gather inspiration and gain schooling. And in this concourse of the best geniuses a pious rivalry arose, giving an ever fresh impulse to the work that was going on. With noble generosity each left a monument of his achievements at the tomb of St. Francis as a token of gratitude to him to whom they felt that they owed all. Not a church or chapel, not a convent wall or ceiling in that favored city which is not sacred with the touch of some inspired brush. It is one vast academy, containing the noblest creations of human genius and piety; and though age has destroyed much of that which, after all, was but the faint expression of so much that is noble and admirable in the Christian's soul, yet there remains enough to make that single town of Assisi, even at this day, the choicest collection of purely Christian art.

The disciples of St. Francis, who in his own day could be counted by thousands, who could be met with in every town and city throughout Italy, and even beyond the Alps and the sea, these perpetuated the spirit of their holy founder. It was not strange, then, that in the face of this new growth of feeling and devotion, the old mummy-like images of the Byzantine school were unable any longer to awaken a responsive echo in the soul of the Christian. Painting up to that time had been entirely in the hands of the Greeks. Their stiff, often grotesque forms, conventional coloring, and unnatural drapery had nothing in them of the ancient grace of their early masters. The new generation, growing up under the monastic discipline and general influence in all spheres of life of the Friars Minor, missed the freshness, the life, the something with a seraph touch in it at which their own hearts could catch fire.

[1] Milman's Latin Christianity, vol. viii., p. 477.

But the young artist, the devout painter who drew the breath of inspiration from the hallowed Grotto of Alvernia, him they understood, and quickly his fame spread, and the builders and the guardians of God's house sought him out, that he might breathe life into the walls, which were to instruct their people and at the same time fitly enshrine the holy of holies.

Some writers have dated the beginning of the mystic school from Gentile da Fabriano, perhaps because at that time it presents a more marked contrast to the Florentine and Bolognese schools, to which the anything but beneficial patronage of the Medici gave eventually so dangerous a direction that it actually undid much of the work of St. Francis by substituting the love of nature for its own sake in place of that love for God's sake. Other writers place Oderisio Gubbio at the head of this school, whilst the honor of having been the first at least to abandon the manner of the Greeks is generally accorded to Cimabue. And yet such men as Giunta Pisano, Guido of Sienna, and others of the same day, unquestionably pointed the way to this departure. An old inscription, mentioned by P. Angeli, says of Giunta that he was the first Italian artist.[1]

It is true that in the works of these early painters there is still a great deal of indecision. It could hardly be otherwise. Art is not in every stage of its life the complete expression of either the spirit or the time that produces it. The soul may be said to be breathed into the rough mass of solid stone in the very conception of the artist, but it wants time to assume shape and form and become the perfect reflection of the original mind. It is in the mature man's face that we trace the peculiar character which is his, developed, indeed, in action, but there in all its peculiarity from the days of his babyhood. Thus these artists served as the connecting link between St. Francis and the most perfect exponents in art of his spirit. They gathered the seed and scattered it about the surrounding mountains and valleys, and it was some time before the new flowers grew up to perfume the air about with their sweet odors. As for Giunta, he was certainly under the direct influence of St. Francis. We know that he went to see him at Assisi, where, as we gather from Lanzi, he painted the first known portrait of the Saint. Soon after the death of the latter he returned to Assisi, and here has left us his best pictures. His paintings in the Church of the Angioli are far superior to the best efforts of the Byzantine school, both in truth to human expression and in disposition of the drapery. He also directed the paintings that were to honor St. Francis in his church at Pisa, which Cimabue and Giotto, it appears, afterwards completed. "These paintings may

[1] Juncta Pisanus ruditer a Græcis instructus
Primus ex Italis artem apprehendit, circa. Ann. Sal., 1210.

be ruder, but they are not less expressive than the floating forms of Guido or Murillo."[1]

Next in order we have Cimabue. He also had learned his art from the Greeks, and his early manner strongly betrays their style. All at once, however, he seems to have come under the spell of St. Francis. There is a picture of the Saint and various little legends surrounding it in the Church of Santa Croce accredited to him, and bearing decided marks of Byzantine training. If it be authentic, which Lanzi doubts, it certainly indicates the direction which his genius took. It seems as if he had vowed henceforth to paint only for the glory of our Saint. In Pisa he completed an altar-piece for the Sons of St. Francis. He then went to Assisi. Here, as in the case of Giunta, we find his best productions. "None of his frescoes," says Lanzi, "give so good an idea of Cimabue's power as the truly magnificent paintings in the Church of Assisi." Here we see the evangelists and doctors of the Church instructing the monks of the Franciscan Order, executed with an originality of conception and arrangement altogether new in the light of contemporary works.

But Giotto still excels him. The paintings of both masters are side by side. Giotto too, true to the love that gave birth to his conceptions, chose for the principal subject of his brush the life of St. Francis. He became the model for generations throughout Tuscany. With him at the same fountain drank Dante. As in the days of Pericles, so there existed at this time a close resemblance of spirit between the art of poetry and that of painting. It was but natural, then, that there should likewise exist an intimate friendship between men of similar talent and like aims. Dante seems even at one time to have given his attention to painting under Giotto's guidance. He certainly was a master in the art of drawing, and we have it on the authority of Benvenuto da Imola[2] and of Baldinucci, in his *Life of Giotto*, that the latter painted at Naples from designs drawn for him by Dante. We may here add the name of Oderisio da Gubbio, who painted with Giotto. Imagine the intercourse of these three men, great souls, inspired by the same noble motives, they pictured, each in his way, yet all in the same grand way, the glories of St. Francis. They have likewise immortalized each other. The undoubtedly most correct portrait of Dante which we have is from the hand of Giotto, whose praises in turn, together with those of Oderisio, are chanted in the melodious stanzas of the *Divina Commedia.*

Restless in his activity and zeal, we see Giotto, so like his holy

---

[1] "Schools and Masters of Painting." A. G. Radcliffe.

[2] "Comento al Canto XI. del Purg.," cited from "Vita di Dante." Leon. Aretino.

patron, spreading the newly-learned gospel of his art in all the cities of Italy, from Naples to Lombardy, and beyond.

We must pass over a host of great painters, masters such as Orcagna, Gentile da Fabriano,—so truly the gentle, in name and in character,—the Bartolos, especially Taddeo, and that remarkable devotee of St. Francis, Margaritone of Arezzo, all in turn continuing and swelling the stream that had its source on Mount Alverno. Following the central line of the Apennines, we see it dividing, one branch with sportive and sounding current passing up into the Romagna, the other peacefully and gently flowing southward through Umbria and towards the Eternal City, both reaching out far into the next century, and inundating with their sweet fresh waters the charming valleys of Italy. And looking north, we meet an angel keeping guard over the waters. His white robe is that of the Sons of St. Dominic. With Fra Angelico the Dominicans take the lead in the field of Christian art. Did the angelic youth of Fiesole, so superior in his way, owe aught to St. Francis of Assisi? We shall see.

It is admitted on all hands that Fra Angelico studied Giotto's manner of painting with great assiduity. His angels—and in these he excels—are imitations of the great master-disciple of Assisi, with only the difference that Angelico applied purer colors. This fact alone might be sufficient to convince us that the genius which St. Francis had diffused about him must likewise have touched the young Dominican. We have seen how the flame that issued from the seraphic patriarch had laid its hold even on St. Dominic, in spite of his totally different genius; how he had sought out St. Francis, sat at his feet to listen to his tales of divine love, and eagerly asked permission to be present at the general chapter of the Friars Minor. He wished to learn from men who had no other school than that of charity, no training but that of unlimited obedience in executing works of love, no doctrine but that of Christian poverty and humility. Whilst his was the lofty intellect appointed by God to gather the straying minds, to confound the heresy of the Albigenses, to crush the serpent's head of a false philosophy, St. Francis was the heart overflowing with affectionate sympathy for his fallen brethren, at war with one another, and without peace in themselves. To him had been assigned the giant task to stay the tide of the lust of the eyes, the passions of the flesh, and to counteract the false asceticism which had taken form in the vagaries of the Waldenses. Yet if we may be permitted to judge the comparative strength of two such giants, so different in parts yet exercising a mutual attraction towards each other, we should incline to call St. Francis the stronger. Love informing the will exercises a greater strain than intellect, convincing and moving to action. And like his

master must have felt the disciple, the pure, the simple-hearted Fra Angelico. How often he traversed, as we read in his life, the beautiful valley between Foligno and Assisi to where St. Francis lay entombed and his daughter in Christ, St. Clare; and there, before the masterpieces we have mentioned, he kindled his devotion and animated his genius, for both were one with him; the handling of his brush was but a prayer of the uplifted soul in contemplation. Looking at his own pictures, and there are comparatively few that remain, we find St. Francis introduced wherever the unity in the conception of his subject permitted it. In almost all his more remarkable pictures of the Blessed Virgin the seraphic saint figures prominently.

If the teacher ordinarily transmits his predilections and his zeal to his pupils, Benozzo Gozzoli, the cherished disciple of Fra Angelico, stands as another proof of the spirit which animated the holy friar of San Marco. "Gozzoli," says Rio,[1] "is another star which contributed to the formation of the crown of glory by which the arts encircled the tomb of St. Francis." His pictures are almost transparent in their chaste purity, singularly so those found in the Franciscan church at Montefalco. When he had to paint the portrait of St. Francis he frequently copied the picture at San Marco. Strange to say, when Benozzo left these pure mountain regions to go to Florence, he seemed to lose his inspiration. His works executed between 1464 and 1467 are said to rise scarcely above mediocrity. Yet the frescoes at Pisa, painted in the decline of his years, are simply marvels of what has been called the patriarchal style of Christian art.[2]

We might go on recounting painters, not only such as nourished their talents with the spirit communicated to them by men who had stood in direct relation to the Saint and his order, but such as were devoted to St. Francis as if he were still their only master; who learned nothing from those whom he had taught, but all from himself; artists who flocked to the place of his birth, to the principal scene of his activity and now his earthly resting-place, as if to invoke the aid of his spirit where they could be nearest to his remains—Pinturicchio and Perugino, whose art was so exquisite that it seemed altogether new—*perdita si fuerat pingendi hic retulit artem; si nusquam inventa est, hactenus ipse dedit;*[3] Francia also, friend and rival of Raphael, with Giacomo his son and Giuglio his relative, who sought shelter even in death in the Church of St. Francis, where they are buried. Raphael himself, in his earlier works, has acknowledged the tribute he owed to St. Francis. And

[1] "The Poetry of Christian Art," p. 133.

[2] These have been restored lately, but, according to accounts, to their utter ruin.

[3] Inscription cited by Orsini.

when the Renaissance had given a new turn to art, even then Assisi was still the place where best men sought inspiration, and St. Francis still remained the subject and his glory the object of their labors. There was always enough to allure the artist to that singular spot, independent of the devout memory he might entertain of the saint. The eleven or twelve communities of Franciscans, in devout procession moving to the tomb of the Saint, their solemn chants, above all, the stirring harmonies of the patriarchal choir, famous by the traditions of several ages, would attune the soul to the right appreciation of those marvellous frescoes that adorn the walls. Wherever the eye turns, from chancel to choir, naves all and dome, even the mosaiqued floors, are wrought by the hands of the Umbrian masters. Nay, the streets of the city itself are full of devout representations in painting, many of rare artistic merit, all breathing the love and spirit of St. Francis.

Even architecture contributes here in an altogether unique way to verify what we have said in the beginning, that the genius of St. Francis had impersonated everything. The architectural structure of the Grand Basilica in Assisi expresses perfectly the idea of the life of St. Francis. "An Italian writer," says the Abbé Riche,[1] "sees in the creation of so wonderful a monument a supernatural effect of divine Providence. He finds himself unable to explain in any other way its appearance at an age when mankind appeared scarcely to awake from barbarism and ignorance."

Roman architecture, such as it existed before this time, expressed on the whole the idea of rest, of strength. It was, as such, not unworthy as an expression of the Christian faith and the security which it had begotten. But lately, the times had become troubled, not, indeed, with the troubles of the early persecutions, when men felt safest as they approached the torture-block—no, these were other troubles. Darkness of pride and strifes and false lights had dimmed the air, and they that felt the stifling atmosphere looked up and sought the pure light of the noonday, and prayed with raised heart and eye, as we see St. Francis pray, in ecstatic longing for the light. The Gothic architecture expressed, so to say, the new feeling. It was a striving upwards. Its long slender columns supporting the pointed arch seemed to end in heaven, all pointed to the infinite that awaits man. But we see much more than this in the temple which enshrines the remains of St. Francis. There are here two churches,—we might say three,—one within the other. In them we have the twofold aspect of his life. His penitence, with its train of voluntary poverty, sacrifices, and suffering resignation, symbolized in the tomb of the saint, who lies there on the ground as he had desired to die, poor, with barely a shroud to cover him;

[1] "Fioretti," by Abbé Riche.

and his monument, the little church of Portiuncula, built with his own hand and still untouched as he had left it. And high above it there tower in noble proportion the marble columns and Gothic dome, speaking to the beholder without his asking for the meaning of the symbol, of glorious and immortal transfiguration. Whilst the inner edifice pronounces the idea of humility, of sweet sadness, that plaintive, childlike hope which is at once full of diffidence in self and trust in the strength on which it leans; the other expresses that ineffable joy which knows no limits and no bounds, rising higher and higher until it touches immortality. It was a beautiful but difficult thought to express. Nowhere has it been more successfully done than in this epic in stone at Assisi.

How much more might be said to show how the spirit of St. Francis was the mainspring which produced not merely the enthusiasm and true love for the beautiful in art, but which gave to it at the same time subject, style, and artist, all, in fact, that made Christian art what it was in the Middle Ages.

And wherever the Sons of St. Francis went, whatever the name or garb or particular rule under which they perpetuated throughout long ages his teachings and his spirit, everywhere we see traces of that same enthusiasm for the arts. The convents and churches of the monks became the treasure-houses and nurseries of painting and sculpture. Raphael, Guido Reni, Domenichino, gave them the best of their pencils in Rome. The Church of St. Francis at Rimini became one of the wonders of the age, for here worked, next to Giotto, his most illustrious disciples, and Giorgio da Rimini, who loved to call himself Giorgio Francesco. But it is time that we conclude our sketch.

Perhaps the reader has, to some extent, realized what the love of God in a single individual is able to effect for the benefit of succeeding generations. Art is certainly a valuable element in the production of human happiness, and the very eagerness with which even its shadow and its counterfeit are sought, stands in confirmation of this truth. May we not hope for a chaster growth of true and elevated taste from the intercession of St. Francis? Our venerable Pontiff, Leo XIII., has seen opportune to recommend, with fatherly solicitude, devotion to the Saint as a powerful means of counteracting the existing evils of modern society. And whilst in reality the conditions of our present society are fundamentally different from those in the thirteenth century, when there was still a strong faith underlying all the vagaries of the human intellect and heart, yet the spirit of St. Francis, if we could revive it in its freshness, would heal many wounds, would undoubtedly diffuse a purer atmosphere round about the world of art. The humble monk out of the dark ages, he could bring light to us. May he vouchsafe to do so!

FREQUENT COMMUNION.

Joannis Bapt. Franzelin e Soc. Jesu. S. R. E. Cardinalis.

Tractatus de SS. Eucharistiæ Sacramento et Sacrificio. Romæ: Ex. Typog. Polyglotta S. C. de Prop. Fide, 1879.

De Re Sacramentaria, Prælectiones Scholasticæ Dogmaticæ, quas habebat Aem. M. De Augustinis, S. J. Woodstock: Ex offic. typog. Collegii, 1878.

Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Compendium. H. Hurter, S. J.

Œniponte. Libraria Academica Wagner, 1881.

Le Confesseur de la Jeunesse. Rev. Père L. J. M. Cros, S. J. Toulouse, 1877.

THE works here mentioned are a standing proof, if such were needed, of the untiring zeal of that great Society which has produced and still presents innumerable champions in every field of literature, and especially those who do valiant service not only in battling against error in its many modern forms, but also in presenting the entire system of the faith once delivered to the saints reasonably and distinctly. In every age, from their institution by St. Ignatius, and in nearly every country, they have been eminently the great thinkers of the Church, from the Council of Trent to that of the Vatican, in each of which their learning and piety were most conspicuous. Yet the practical work, enduring beyond any praise, is probably to be found in the vast erudition of their theologians, who constantly are engaged in enriching the Church of the living God, the mother they love so well, by their marvellous talent in presenting clearly and definitely the most abstruse doctrines, and making the same to be living verities for the salvation of souls.

This is, indeed, the ulterior motive of the existence of that Society which has for its motto the symbol A. M. D. G.—*Ad majorem Dei gloriam*—emblazoned on its banner. And since the greater glory of God consists in the salvation of souls by making known the truth, it has always been the aim of these faithful soldiers of the cross to excel in leading men to a knowledge of the means divinely instituted to attain the end of creation; to know, reverence, and adore their Creator, and thus forever be happy.

The means of advancing in this nobler life of the soul, or spiritual life, are found in the Church, which teaches authoritatively all truth. They may be called, in some sense, subjective and objective. The former require, at all events, some correspondence with Divine grace; the latter include this, indeed, but by the institution of Christ possess in themselves an active principle, whereby cer-

tain graces, not otherwise attainable, are conveyed to the soul of him who places no positive hindrance in the way. The former, always supposing sufficient foregoing grace to act, consist in a thoughtful consideration of one's origin, destiny, and condition, —an examination of one's life; meditation on truths which constantly present themselves to sober minds; and finally, prayer, as the outburst of our needs to Him who can help us.

The Sacraments, however, are of an infinitely greater value, for they are the channels of God's mercy to man, and by the will of Jesus Christ, their Founder and Author, have the power of conveying to the soul that grace which they signify; and this takes place by their own intrinsic worth wheresoever an absolute hindrance be not interposed. This efficacy is contained in each, according to its nature and the object of its institution, which object varies, indeed, according to the different conditions of life, covering every state of society in which men are found. The Sacraments, therefore, offer a complete armor against human frailty, or they lift fallen and disabled nature, which was never destroyed, but only wounded and weakened by original sin, and further depressed by actual transgressions; they give to our lives some foretaste of eternal peace; they elevate our minds to heavenly desires and make us wish for our heritage of true dignity.

Since, then, these are the chief means by and through which we can attain salvation, and since these learned theologians have compressed whole libraries into brief and concise shape, as witnessed above, it would be no easy task to formulate sufficient praise for the work accomplished. In order to do so, it would require something of the immense learning they themselves possess, for, speaking in their praise seems like the work of a tyro in arithmetic daring to discuss concerning numbers with a perfect and accomplished mathematician. To any, even the most superficial, reader, however, it must occur that the magnificent apparatus of doctrinal proof from the teaching of the Church, as shown by plain texts of Holy Scripture, not wrested or twisted to agree with preconceived opinions, but interpreted by the best hermeneutical and exegetical skill; the coinciding testimony of the Fathers, whose works are not ransacked and ravaged and forced to say what the writers never could have thought, and what is incoherent with all the rest of their writings, but the well-weighed-out teachings which are in perfect harmony with the body of doctrine they elsewhere inculcate—*simplex duntaxat et unum.* The doctors of the Church, whether Latin or Greek, fully collated, dispassionately interpreted, clearly understood by the ever living practical voice of tradition, are here marshalled in battle array before the thoughtful student. Well may the saints sing pæans of holy triumph for the overwhelming

victory of the infallible Church, which is ever conquering, for she has and maintains superiority as the unflinching witness of truth throughout all ages.

We may very fairly infer that our faith is little likely to suffer any diminution when such works, in marked earnestness, are constantly being edited, for they are but the echo of the living voice of these erudite professors, who have youth under their charge from every part of the world, drinking in deep draughts of wisdom from the fountain and source of truth. The vigor of a living voice in the lecture-room, the magnetism of contact with active and energetic young minds, throbbing with anxious questionings, may be wanting in the dead reading of a book, however interesting that book may be. But in these works we seem to live again, and far from having undergone any diminution, our ardor is in full flow. Not only the young student, but even the advanced theologian feels himself in an incomparably better condition than in former days. Here are the forcible arguments of all time placed before us in the most succinct manner; here we have easy access to the studies of those who have borne the toil of the day and the heat; here are the well-formed conclusions of those who have collected from the most recondite, and to us inaccessible sources, all the learning of our predecessors. Not only these hidden stores have been lavishly bestowed upon us, but the modern wealth of science, the true as well as that "falsely so-called" is not ignored, but duly grappled with by these men who spend their venerable lives in laboring for posterity.

He who reaps the greatest advantage is, perhaps, not the student, just making his course of theology, but rather the priest who is on the mission, yet wishes to keep himself fairly well informed in what is to few an alluring study; for it is given to a very small number to have passed more than the mere threshold of the mighty temple of Theology. Now, he who is thrown into the carking cares of an ill-supplied mission has hardly any time to spare in gathering up the arguments of former years, or collecting the apt similes of the Fathers, however striking they may be. Over and above the fact that a full set of these authorities is certainly not possessed by one in a thousand, even if the works were on hand, how many would have time, or patience, supposing even ability to undertake the search after testimonies, the collating of them when found, the joining of them together into one synoptic whole, and, finally, the deducing of practical arguments. We remember that a very learned Father once had the kindness to say to us that the only method of knowing an author, and, particularly, any of the Fathers, is by reading him through and through. How few have done this with any theological work?

What shall we say of the ponderous tomes of the Greek and Latin Fathers? Only those can have done so who had material time at their disposal.

Here, on the other hand, we have no want of industry; no deficit of time unapplied; here is no deficiency in collecting, arranging, examining, and putting in system, what would cost years of trouble, as it costs the learned writers lives of toil and assiduity, to collect and place in form before us a perfect harvest of well-selected crops.

These, surely, are reasons for thankfulness to the authors, quite in keeping with the modest demeanor justly to be observed by us; it is, therefore, by no means our purpose to speak of the relative merits of the treatises, for we admit our incompetence to criticise,—it is not our *forte*,—we rather admit the profound awe with which we look upon so much accumulated learning, and, in all sincerity, we dare to express even in public our heartfelt thankfulness, and an earnest wish that all priests may obtain the works indicated, and make a diligent use of them.

Whilst we merely indicate our appreciation of the Dogmatical part referred to, it would be well that the practical portion, especially treated by the Rev. Father Cros, S. J., should be read carefully by our clergy. Few books have ever fallen in our way more signally concise in their statements than is the work having for title *Le Confesseur de la Jeunesse*. It is a real treasure, not only for the practical direction of youth, but also of every age and condition of life. After giving in compendious words the facts belonging to Jansenism—that foul insurrection against the voice of legitimate authority, which spread insidiously and rapidly under the guise of superior sanctity, and deluded many Catholics, and left its trail of slime in so many different ways on the theology of France and Belgium and other countries—the assertion is made that the originators of this sect had a design to withdraw the faithful both from their allegiance to the Sovereign Pontiff, which was evident, and from the use of the Sacraments, especially the two which are, and ought to be, of daily importance,—Penance and Holy Communion. Whether or not they actually foresaw what would be the logical effect of their teachings, they certainly obtained such influence over the press as to possess control over many of the spiritual works thence issued, and these were thoroughly saturated with the spirit of ostentatious severity characteristic of the leaders. Instead of bringing the sinner to Christ, in showing that the name Jesus signifies, in its full sense, "He will save His people from their sins,"—St. Matth. i: 21, they represented Him as a formidable judge, who had no compassion until, by a full and rigorous course of justice, the offended majesty of God had been previously satis-

fied. The power which He exercised for the benefit of sinners seemed rather a *reward* of their own good works than a merciful bestowal of omnipotent power by God upon men for the elevation of human nature. In the false theory held by them long and multiplied expiations were requisite in order to receive a favorable sentence. The texts of Scripture which present our Lord as having come "not to call the righteous but sinners to repentance," were carefully kept in the background, whilst the terrific judgments of God upon the impenitent—and all were depraved entirely—were fitfully poured out after a truly Calvinistic method. The choice of a confessor was described as something which required a matured judgment, of which the young were incapable in the nature of things, and the old, or more advanced in years, could not reasonably be expected to make. Then, it was made to be high treason to change one's spiritual guide, and not even in religious communities was the selection free. The examination of conscience was to be made after the most strenuous style, and unless this had been rigorously carried out by the sinner he should be put off until he had done so to the satisfaction of the confessor, who was thus to impress upon his penitent the depth of his depravity. Added to all this, things were asserted to be sins which are not; precepts were made which nowhere appear as obligatory; they proclaimed that sins are possible of commission by us without any knowledge on our part; asserted the utterly depraved nature of man; insisted on the confession of such circumstances as do not change the nature of a sin; reproached in harsh tones the poor sinner who, when he comes, stands much rather in need of help and encouragement, and who has this always in his favor, that the very fact of coming of his own accord is *primâ facie* evidence of his good disposition and actual desire for advance.

The opposite of all tenderness towards the sinner was a standing proof of heresy.

But, if they thus treated the ordinary sinner who had begun to feel, from the saddest experience, his need of the grace of the Sacrament of Penance, what shall we say of the harshness with which they pursued those who fell again? They kept them from the benefit of absolution, and consequently from Communion, under the specious pretext of thus rendering themselves worthy of participating in this *reward of merit*. And to keep up this illusion they constantly kept praising the "primitive church," as they were pleased to style those ages when a system of public penance had (what they should have mentioned) only a temporary place in the polity of the Church. Thence long exhortations on the *Flentes*, or Weepers, who stood at the doors, and, bowed down in grief, testified the sincerity of their sorrow; or on the *Prostrati, Audientes, et Con-*

sistentes. In order to restore this pristine rigor, at least as much as possible, long and arduous penances were kept up after the siege of preparation for admission to first Communion, and between that and the subsequent one, and the intervals were made as protracted as the case would admit. Directions of such impracticable character were given, that earthly duties could not be duly attended, and thus the frequenting of the Sacraments was rendered odious, all, mark you well, under the garb of the absolute necessity of greater preparation. The worst form of Jansenism cropped out, however, in the treatment of children and young persons. They were not heard in the sacred tribunal until a definite year had been attained. Even then, despite the fact that children are very different in their precocious mental developments, absolution was invariably refused until they were about to be stretched on the Procustean couch of a first Communion year. This was a favorite theory among the Jansenists, which found not a few imitators even among those who, had they only thought, would never have permitted such perversion of right reason.

After such lengthy arraignment of some of the charges proved against the Jansenists and their adherents, the learned author gives an instruction of the Holy Father, Pius IX., of happy memory, under date March 12th, 1855, to certain French prelates concerning the insufficient manner in which children are prepared for their first Communion, and the time and the method of taking care of them spiritually, both before and after. This instruction is given by the author in full, and deserves very particular mention.

"It has been represented to His Holiness that sacramental absolution is refused to young folks before their first Communion, leaving them, one cannot say on what theological principles, even up to the age of twelve or fourteen years, in a truly dangerous state, in a spiritual point of view.

"Moreover, that even after their admission for the first time to the Holy Table, it is usual to debar them from Communion, even at the Paschal season, and to keep them from the same for a long time, in some places.

"And that there are even seminaries where the custom reigns of keeping the young pupils for several months from Holy Communion, under the pretext of making a riper preparation.

"Knowing of what importance the Sacraments of Penance and the Eucharist are for keeping and preserving the innocence of youth; knowing that the frequent use of the Sacraments contributes admirably to the budding piety of these young hearts, we could hardly admit the exactness of these charges, despite the authority of those who attested them; nevertheless, information

taken from various places established the fact that in a notable measure the *désordres signalés* really exist.

"In consequence, the Holy Father, wishing to put an end to practices so contrary to the spiritual interests of youth, . . . asks you to reform such method, it being opposite to the spirit and discipline of the Church.

". . . . Thus we shall see that young people are everywhere admitted, in a suitable manner, to the frequenting of the Sacraments, and the deplorable customs to the contrary will disappear."

The plan, therefore, of keeping young people from the benefit of the actual use of the Sacraments is distinctly condemned.

In reference to the age at which a child is bound to make the Paschal duty, we have the *minimum* fixed by the IV. Council of Lateran: "Postquam ad annos discretionis pervenerit, semel saltem confiteatur, suscipiens, reverenter, ad minus in Pascha, Eucharistiae Sacramentum." The age of discretion is certainly not the same for all children, but the weight of authority seems to denote the obligation as certainly binding in the tenth year; no *minimum* is in any way fixed for permission to give Holy Communion, beyond the general words of the Council of Trent, session xxi., chap. iv., "Eadem Sancta Synodus docet, parvulos, *usu rationis carentes*, nulla obligari necessitate ad sacramentalem Eucharistiae Communionem," whilst, in like manner, St. Thomas teaches, "quando jam pueri incipiunt *aliqualem usum rationis* habere, ut possint devotionem concipere hujus Sacramenti, tunc potest eis hoc Sacramentum conferri."

If the adage, "train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it," be the Scriptural expression of "the twig being bent, the tree will be inclined," nothing can be of greater importance than the anticipating of evil in the tender mind of the child, by having our Lord to take possession before actual evil has had the chance to find a resting-place. As the Sacraments are not a recompense of virtues which we possess, but remedies against vice, and auxiliary forces divinely appointed, and necessary for even good wills, we should see that the child be placed betimes in proper guardianship. Now, since the year of one's first Communion is usually the best spent, and experience seems to state that after one's first Communion there is still and always marked need of sacramental grace, frequency of Communion should be inculcated, since Christ does not say: "If you receive absolution you shall have life,—he who receiveth absolution remains in me and I in him," but He does say: "He that eateth Me, the same also shall live by Me."

Not only has no law ever been made discountenancing frequent

Communion, but, on the contrary, the most ancient voice of the Church, the perpetual tradition as handed down by the Fathers, councils, and saints, as well as by all orthodox spiritual advisers, inculcates the advisability and even necessity of approaching often to this eternal fount of divine assistance.

What, then, are the dispositions absolutely required to make a fruitful communion? The Council of Trent, Sess. xiii., Chap. vii., says expressly: "Ecclesiastica consuetudo declarat eam probationem necessariam esse, ut nullus sibi conscius mortalis peccati, quantumvis sibi contritus videatur, absque præmissa sacramentali confessione ad Sacram Eucharistiam accedere debeat."

In order to approach Holy Communion in such manner as to fulfil the apostle's precept, "Let a man prove himself" (1 Cor. xi., 28), it is not required that more should necessarily be done than to use such diligence as would be manifested by men who are seriously engaged in a matter of importance in every-day life. This in strict necessity requires, for the purpose in hand, a diligent inspection of those sins which are known to a man's conscience to be weighty, and the conscience of each is sure to speak when untrammelled. Should still further guidance in knowing sins be required, the spiritual director will judiciously impart the same. Then, detesting these sins, with an earnest purpose of amendment, make a true and entire confession of them, with a willingness to accept and perform the satisfaction imposed. Should it happen, as it very frequently does, that nothing serious weights the conscience, there is no law to hinder an approach to Holy Communion, and the fruit will certainly be produced by the efficacy of the Sacrament in virtue of the promise of Christ: "He who eateth Me, the same shall live by Me" (St. John vi., 58). In either case there will be no fear of falling under the terrible ban of the apostle of "eating or drinking . . . unworthily . . . not discerning the Body of the Lord" (1 Cor. xi., 27–29). This takes away the smallest pretext of calling the Sacrament of Penance a torture of conscience, *conscientiæ carnificinam*, so much harped upon by ancient and modern heretics, and it entitles the sinner to that repose of soul which is otherwise not possible even on merely human grounds; much less can it be called a torture when there is a divine command to examine, and, in conformity therewith, if serious sins appear, to confess, accept guidance, and hear the application of that power which Christ exercised, promised to the Church, and daily grants, through His priests, to the suitably disposed: "Whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained" (St. John xx., 23).

As to smaller faults, which have very justly the title of *venial*, we have distinctly the teaching of the Council of Trent, Sess. xiv.,

Chap. 5, "taceri citra culpam, multisque aliis remediis expiari possunt." Hence, whilst we may confess them with great advantage, yet there is simply no obligation, *per se*, of doing so. The Council insists that the Eucharist is remedy for past, antidote against future sins, and aliment of grace for our souls, whence the doctrine may be summed up for the comfort of timid souls, that no *antecedens*, foregoing, venial sin can hinder the effect of this Divine Sacrament. That by no accompanying, *concomitans* fault (in one free from mortal sin) is an increase of habitual grace impeded, but no increase of sensible devotion is promised at all, or probable, in such case. "Sumi autem voluit Sacramentum hoc, tanquam spiritualem animarum cibum, quo alantur et confortentur viventes vita Illius qui dixit: 'Qui manducat Me, et ipse vivet propter Me, et tanquam antidotum, quo liberemur a culpis quotidianis, et a peccatis mortalibus præservemur,'" Sess. xiii., Chap. 2.

The pious author finishes his work by stating that the whole object of it is chiefly to trace out the general method approved by the Church, through councils, doctors, and saints (whose testimony he produces), in the administration of the Sacraments of Penance and the Holy Eucharist. That these Sacraments must be used for the cure of souls, and that youth should be specially fortified by frequent approach to these sources of grace. It follows, and is subsequently touched upon, that with those who are already accustomed as young people to come to them greater fruits of sanctity may be lawfully and surely expected, but that to advance in the path of virtue without the use of the Sacraments is truly "il voler passar per l'aer' senz'ali,"—an attempt to fly wingless.

THE IRISH SITUATION.

THE object of the following pages is to lay before the readers of this REVIEW an impartial and accurate estimate—so far as the writer is able—of the forces and factors that are at work in the solution of the Irish question at the present hour. Naturally, if not logically, the first point of consideration will be the position of the Gladstone Cabinet, and the change which the new Rules of Procedure have effected in the parliamentary machine.

A month or so ago, there were even cautious political observers ready to declare that the satisfactory results of the Egyptian campaign had secured for the government a fund of popular favor that could be drawn freely upon for a considerable period to come, and the phrase was common, even among habitual detractors of Mr. Gladstone, that he held the Premiership for life. These prophecies were made on the morrow of a victory in the field, and were naturally suffused with the glow of such an event. Popular enthusiasm with regard to the war has considerably cooled down since then. By the inevitable law of reaction, the English people have grown probably a little shamefaced over their rather disproportional self-gratulation on the defeat of a contemptible foe; and the government have still before them the enormously difficult problem of making a permanent and satisfactory settlement as to the future of Egypt. It will be necessary to make all these abatements in considering the effect of the Egyptian enterprise on the political fortunes of the government, and the final result may be to leave them just a decent balance of reputation—the record of not having done very ill, and not having done very well. Nor would it be safe to predict that, if an immediate appeal were made to the English constituencies, the result would be the return of even as large a majority as that which the Liberal party enjoys in the present House of Commons. No theme has afforded English writers a subject of more frequent self-laudation than the favorable contrast between the stability of English institutions and opinion, and the incalculable instability and fickleness of institutions operating in other lands. The institutions of England are stable; but, there is scarcely any country in the world where political opinion is subject to more sudden and more violent and unaccountable transformations. When Mr. Gladstone was Prime Minister before, his administration was free from any of the disastrous features of his second tenure of office; in the course of five years he framed measures which abolished Protestant ascendency in Ireland, gave, or was intended to give, the first shake to the absolute power of the rich landlord, de-

stroyed by the ballot territorial and capitalist intimidation in England and Scotland as well as Ireland, put an end to the shameful corruption of purchase in the army, and conferred on the English people their first Education Act; and yet, when, apparently in the plenitude and almost the wantonness of his power, he appealed for a renewal of his mandate to the English constituencies, the English constituencies responded by casting him into impotence, and elevating a cynic, selfish and unbelieving Jew to a position of almost unequalled power. It is, therefore, impossible to predict what is the opinion of the constituencies with regard to the government, and yet it is safe to assume that its position at the present moment is very strong, and has all the superficial signs of durability.

A powerful majority in Parliament is not always a guarantee of the retention of office by a Liberal minister; there are inevitable differences of opinion between the different sections of the Liberal party which exercise a constantly disintegrating force, and under the senseless system by which a hereditary chamber of landowners is clothed with constitutional power equal to that of the chamber elected by popular suffrage, the leader of the Conservative party in the House of Peers has it always within his right to provoke a constitutional crisis. But Mr. Gladstone at the present moment seems quite free from either of these two dangers. Taking the latter peril first, the House of Lords has the characteristic timidity of hereditary chambers,—in the present year, for instance, it repudiated the leadership of the Marquis of Salisbury and swallowed the Arrears Bill,—and the House of Lords rarely exercises its veto on legislation, unless at the same time the minister is weak in the House of Commons and is but feebly backed by the country. And finally, there is this excellent reason for regarding the danger to the ministry from the House of Lords as at the moment infinitesimal: Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues have made up their minds not to be expelled from office by any vote of the House of Lords until the collision comes upon some popular measure, such as the reduction of the franchise in the English counties, which will supply the Liberal party with a splendid grievance and a catching cry. The country, then, being, so far as is known, friendly to the government, and the danger from the House of Lords being small, the key to the situation is the position of the government in the third factor of this triangular problem,—that is to say, in the House of Commons.

On this point, it is easier to use the language of exaggeration than of moderation; for, assuredly, it has rarely fallen to the lot of any man to occupy a place of such commanding authority in any popular assembly as that which is now enjoyed by Mr. Glad-

stone in the House of Commons. This is not the place to enter into a discussion of the mental or moral character of the present Prime Minister of England; it must suffice to say that, in many respects, he is, perhaps, the greatest parliamentarian the English House of Commons has ever produced. He has full command of nearly all the resources of the orator,—passion, forcible exposition of argument, lucidity of statement,—even, occasionally, effective playfulness; and the resources of his power of reply—sometimes just, and very often sophistical—even practically unlimited. He has, besides, the ideal parliamentary temper, for, though he is not supposed to be a good proof of ardor in the individual, he has a power of gathering in the feelings of the crowd around him with a rapidity that amounts to an instinct, and a nature thus readily impressionable and sympathetic enables him to accommodate his mood to that of the very moment as faithfully as the actor of genius expresses the changing temper of a Shakesperian character. It has often been remarked that a deaf man could give some fair guess as to what was going on in the House of Commons, if he could only see and closely observe the face of Mr. Gladstone,—which reflects as faithfully as the mirror, and is as changeable as the sea under the alternate sunshine and cloud of an April sky. All these great natural gifts have been cultivated to the highest point. Mr. Gladstone's knowledge is vast, his memory marvellously retentive, and he has a political and parliamentary experience that reached, on a day in the month of December, the term of fifty years. And, finally, the gifts of mind, fitness of disposition, and acquirements are set off by those physical advantages which form so large a part in the effectiveness of an orator,—a splendid face, a fine figure, and a voice that, though slightly enfeebled, is still melodious, expressive, and powerful.

Mr. Gladstone's own colleagues are said to dislike him, and, as he practically monopolizes all the talk and all the work, and stands out in relief so bold as to dwarf all surrounding men, this is intelligible. But they, at the same time, know that it is he who has the hold over Parliament, and, still more, that he is the centre of popular attention, and the target—so to speak—of popular affection and enthusiasm; and thus they obey and flatter him, and even Sir William Harcourt, who, at one time, dreamed of being a possible rival, and who passes still for being the most venomous among the whole Ministry in his hate to his chief, even Sir William Harcourt is compelled, whenever he speaks, to pour fulsome eulogies on Mr. Gladstone's head. It is the same thing, but, of course, in an exaggerated form, with the rank and file of the Prime Minister's followers. The full and swelling tide of popular enthusiasm, which floated the Liberal party into power in 1880, was the creation of

Gladstone, and of Gladstone alone; Gladstone supplied the popular cry and the magnetic name; and all the electioneering wire-puller, therefore, required, in the selection of candidates at the last General election, was a sufficiency of means,—for election contests continue to be very expensive in England,—and an orthodox faith in the goodness of Mr. Gladstone, and the wickedness of Lord Beaconsfield, the Tories, and the Turks. Nameless men were thus, in the vast majority of cases, returned for the English constituencies; the few intelligent men among the crowd,—owing to the absorption of the time of Parliament in fighting Irish obstruction or passing Irish measures of relief,—have not had any opportunity of distinguishing themselves, and nine out of ten of the entire Liberal members remain with but shadowy names to the constituencies; they knew of Mr. Gladstone, and Mr. Gladstone alone, and even a slight difference from the views of the Prime Minister,—a vote against him on an immaterial point, a feeble or brief protest against any of his remarks,—in one notable case, the mere fact of frequent speaking to the slight interruption of the Premier's plans,—any one of these trifles is sufficient to bring down on the unfortunate member a sharp protest from his constituents.

Finally, the position of Mr. Gladstone is rendered stronger by the contemptible impotency of his opponents. Sir Stafford Northcote's hopeless feebleness has procured for him the unflattering nickname of the "grand old woman." Mr. Gladstone is called by the comic journals, and in the *deshabille* of private conversation, the "grand old man." Lord John Manners is consistently lachrymose. Sir Richard Cross, pettifogging. Mr. Plunkett and Mr. Gibson—the two Irishmen who do a little to relieve the general dulness of the front Opposition bench—are unequal to the situation of leadership; the one, from incurable laziness and constitutional unreadiness; the other, because, though his tongue is fatally fertile in words, his mind is essentially narrow and bigoted. I do not wish to be flippant or irreverent; but the sight of the front Opposition bench, in the House of Commons, always recalls to my mind the row of feeble and frowsy old ladies whom one sees sparsely scattered on the evenings of a week-day in the little Bethel of one of the obscure ranting preachers of London. To sum up: what with his own great powers, the loyalty of his friends, and the feebleness of his foes, Mr. Gladstone, to-day, is supreme in Parliament; the unchecked dictator, rather than the constitutional leader of that assembly.

We have now arrived at a just estimate of one of the principal factors in the problem we are considering; we have reached the conclusion that the position of Mr. Gladstone—that is to say, of the present administration—has all the outward evidence of great

strength. Let us now proceed to the consideration of a second factor in the problem of the Irish situation at the present hour. What is the general position of the Irish party? And how is it affected by the change in the rules of the House of Commons? I may say at once, and in the most distinct terms, that these rules —in so far as it is allowable to pronounce any opinion on laws that have not as yet been brought into full operation—are effectual against Irish obstruction. To this should be added the statement that obstruction has largely helped to get for Ireland many of the great reforms of the last few years; and it would, therefore, be vain and childish to deny that an important parliamentary weapon is finally and regularly removed from the hands of the Irish parliamentarians. But in saying this I have used the words "finally and regularly," and these words suggest a most important qualification in considering the change in the Irish parliamentary position. For, as a matter of fact, obstruction had been disposed of before the introduction of the new rules at all. Obstruction would live as long—and no longer—as the House of Commons respected its own laws and traditions. These laws and traditions once broken with, obstruction could be easily put down. The first great obstructive fight against coercion by the Irish members was terminated by the speaker's *coup d'état.* The principle laid down by Sir Henry Brand was, that the occurrence of a grave parliamentary crisis justified him in closing the debate at a certain point arbitrarily, of his own motion, and without any consultation, much less vote of the House. The action of Dr. Lyon Playfair, the chairman of committees in the present year, carried the power of the chair to a still more advanced point. He suspended, it will be remembered, a number of the Irish members together, although some of them were absent and in bed at the time of the suspension, and although the greater number of them had distinguished themselves rather by their reticence than by their activity in opposing the coercion bill. The grounds of this extraordinary decision were, that the different members were acting together, and therefore responsible for each other's conduct; and the chairman further held that, though members might not be guilty of any one act that could be called obstructive, yet it might become obstructive by a series of acts extending over a number of nights. There may have been serious misgivings with regard to these acts of high-handed authority by the speaker and the chairman of committees, and the action of the latter was freely criticised in private at the time, and since has been openly condemned; but when the opinion of Parliament came to be taken, immediately after both, the one *coup d'état* and the other, the chair was supported by the House of Commons. These two judgments thus confirmed became, therefore, the law of

Parliament; and what did the law of Parliament then come to, so far as the Irish members were concerned? First, that the speaker could, in case of emergency, establish a *clôture* on the Irish members at such moment as he thought fit; and secondly, that the speaker or chairman of committees could suspend the Irish members *en masse* whenever their hostility to any particular measure extended over a longer number of nights than seemed convenient to the ministerial mind. Whether the members were present or absent, silent or garrulous, did not matter; if there was evidence of combination—and as the members form a party and act together as a party, there is always "evidence of combination"—if there was evidence of combination, they could all be held accountable for the actions of the others. The new rules, it will be known, surround the exercise of authority with limitations from which these authoritative decisions had left the chair free. The speaker can now call for the *clôture*, but his demand must be supported by a majority of the House; and while the power of suspension is left to the chair, it must be done individually, unless when a number of men in a body join in some act of disregard to the authority of the chair, such, for instance, as refusing in a body to enter the division lobbies, as was done on the night of the arrest of Mr. Davitt. In other words, constructive obstruction—the new offence created by Dr. Lyon Playfair—is entirely done away with.

These considerations are sufficient to show that obstruction had been met, and to a large extent beaten, before the introduction of the new rules; and in connection with this feature of the situation there is one other fact which deserves to be taken into serious account. Obstruction, as a protest against a particular measure, has been made unnecessary by the government for a considerable period to come. The last coercion act was passed for the space of three years. For three years to come the Irish members have no call upon them to offer fierce and prolonged opposition to any measure of the existing administration, and, therefore, for that space of time obstruction ceases to have one of its main uses. There are two other points which can be counted on in drawing up the favorable side in the estimate of the effect which the new rules will produce on the fortunes of the Irish party. The adoption of the *clôture* introduces a novel and in many respects by no means a pleasant feature into the parliamentary struggles of English parties. Up to the present hour, fierce as these struggles have been, they have been distinguished from those of some other lands by their general freedom from personal rancor or partisan fury. The fiercest of opponents in public were often the best of friends in private; toleration for differences of opinion was an axiom not merely of Parliament, but of the political life of all

England; and there was altogether that geniality of temper in politics which is, in their better moods, one of the best characteristics of Englishmen in most of their relations in life. But the forcible suppression of speech by one party of another is a measure that must produce bitterness of feeling, and its force will be increased by the fact that this novel rule in Parliament comes at the same time as the introduction of the caucus, the "machine," and other strange implements of party warfare. It is safe, I think, to make the inference from these facts that the virus of rigid and relentless partisanship has for the first time entered into the blood of the English parties, and their loss is our gain; when they are divided, we have some chance; when they are united, we are undone. This may put one of the many excellent reasons for that vote against the two-thirds *clôture* proposed by the Tories, which has exposed Mr. Parnell and his followers to so much senseless or dishonest attacks. The second point by which the position of the Irish party is rather improved by the change of the rules is in the matter of adjournment. Every session of the house, as the majority of the readers of this REVIEW well know, is opened with a series of questions to ministers; and if any member was dissatisfied with the answer which he received, he had the right to at once move the adjournment of the House, and to force a discussion on any subject which, in his opinion, demanded immediate attention. This was a potent weapon; but its employment caused so much dissatisfaction and disapproval in the House that the good expected by raising a question in such a form was often very questionable. This power is now taken away from the individual member, but it is given to forty members to force a debate on any point which they declare to be a matter of "urgent public importance." The effect of such a rule is to make legal and regular a practice which was formerly irregular and inconvenient. Mr. Parnell has already made good use of the new privilege by forcing a discussion on the working of the Arrears Act; and it is probable that in future sessions he will be able, under this rule, to have an Irish debate on any night he may deem advisable. This is a very important gain.

When all these things, however, have been said, the fact still remains that the Irish party has not the same control as formerly over the business arrangements of the House of Commons, and cannot bring the potent pressure which the knowledge of the existence of such a power enables it to exercise over the action of the ministers. There are means in the new rules for meeting any and every form of obstruction which a weak party could adopt. The individual member can be silenced under the rule which permits the speaker to put an end to "tedious and irrelevant" speak-

ing, while members obstructing in a body can have their mouths closed by the *clôture*. Motions for adjournment used formerly to supply food for a dilatory debate of hours; for under a motion for adjournment there was practically no topic the introduction of which could be prevented as being disorderly. Under the new rules speeches on a motion for adjournment must be confined strictly to that point. The call for a division, if declared by the speaker to be obstructive, can be prevented, and finally there remains untouched, except in the matter of "constructive obstruction," the old power of the chair to suspend any member who is guilty of "wilful and persistent obstruction." It is hard to discover any form of obstruction which a small body like the Irish party could resort to with impunity under rules so stringent and so wide-embracing. This, then, brings us to our conclusion on the second point of our inquiry. We have found, under the first head, that we had to deal with a strong government; and now, under the second head of our inquiry, we are driven to the conclusion that the strong government has, under the new rules, a vastly increased control over the business of the House of Commons; not only is the arm of the enemy more potent, but he has guns of longer range, and swords of sharper blade.

And now, advancing to the third branch of our inquiry, we must ask ourselves, what is the position of the government in Ireland? Everybody in America knows that a coercion act of great stringency was passed in the present year, but probably few Americans realize —from the circumstances of their own country it would be impossible they could realize—how complete, how scrutinizing, how—so to speak—ubiquitous is the operation of this last message of peace to Ireland. There is scarcely an act of individual or of social, and there is no act of political, life, with which some provision of this measure does not interfere; it is, in fact, not a coercion act, but a full, complete, and exhaustive code of coercion. Under its provisions the Lord Lieutenant can (1) suppress any organization, (2) prohibit any public meeting, and (3) suppress any newspaper. The clause dealing with journals has certain limitations, but these amount to little, and the statement that a journal can be suppressed is practically true. The inhabitants of any city—even of the capital —can be made liable to imprisonment if found outside their own homes at any time in the interval between an hour after sunset and sunrise. It is hard to know what words can be used on a platform which will not make the speaker liable to six months' imprisonment with hard labor. For under the intimidation clause of the act any words are illegal which are calculated to prevent the performance of a legal, or induce the performance of an illegal act, or which are calculated to injure any person in his business or calling.

This clause is framed with such intentional vagueness that no proof is required of any individual having been intimidated or in any way interfered with ; it is sufficient that the words so employed should be calculated to intimidate some person or persons unknown and undiscoverable, and the sole judges of the probable consequence of the words employed are two stipendiary magistrates, servants and protégés of the Lord Lieutenant. The Lord Lieutenant can pour any number of police into any district, and can impose on any locality—large and small—it may be a townland, or a parish, or a portion of a townland or a parish, down to a few houses, or a certain number of farms—a ruinous police or blood tax. Finally, trial by jury for any offence, whether political or criminal, has been, either entirely abolished or been maintained in a form that is but a mockery of the name. As was seen in the trials of Francis Hynes and the two Walshes, a prisoner may be brought before an Orange judge and an exclusively Orange jury—prepared to convict, guilty or not guilty ; the court of justice may be degraded to a level lower than that of a Ribbon Lodge ; and a journalist who protests, no matter how true his charges, or high his position, is liable to a length of imprisonment, and an amount of fining, limited only by the caprice of a ferociously partisan judge. Such a mode of legal procedure would be infamous if employed against even a murderer—for the murderer is, under the laws of every civilized land, presumed to be innocent until he is proved guilty, and, under the word and spirit of the British constitution, is entitled to be tried by his peers ; but it must be remembered that exactly the same kind of justice could be meted out to the man charged with a political offence. The imagination will not easily conceive of a political act of an Irish Nationalist which cannot be caught in the wide net of the law of treason, or treason felony, or sedition, or some other of the many phrases by which is designated hostility to English domination in Ireland. And one need not pause to think what would be the character of the trial of Mr. Parnell or any other Irishman of strong opinions, with Mr. Lawson as judge, a parcel of Dublin Orange shopkeepers for jurors, and the ready evidence of that political brood of informers whose perjured oaths are one of the bulwarks of British civilization in Ireland.

Such, then, is the position, and such are the powers of the government; and now, what of the Irish people themselves? Everybody is agreed that there has been something like a lull in Ireland for some months past, and assuredly nobody can wonder that a period of exhaustion should follow the fierce and terrible struggle of the last three years. It argues absolute ignorance, or absolute blindness, to hold that a whole people can always be kept in the same state of high terror and frenzied excitement. Ireland is—so far as I can judge

—suffering to some extent from natural and inevitable reaction. Neither cause at work is the operation of the law and the Arrears Act. There is reason for the gravest dissatisfaction with the decisions of the majority of the land courts, and the average reduction is far below the standard which is demanded to enable the farmer really to live and to thrive. Of course, too, some of the Land League leaders are willing that the fixing of even a reduced rent should divert the attention of the tenantry from the original and permanent purpose of the League,—the establishment of the tenantry as permanent proprietors of their fields, and even conservatives like Mr. Gibson are willing to admit that the purchase clauses of the Land Act have entirely broken down. Then the lease-holders find themselves absolutely excluded from the benefit of the act, and the lease clause, according to the verdict of the tenants of the North as well as of the South, has been reduced to a nullity. All these abatements are necessary to be made to guard against that irrational spirit of undue exultation which is the chronic condition of the Whiggish section of Irish politicians, when any Irish measure of relief has been passed by a Liberal administration. On the other hand, a spirit of undue depreciation is quite as fatal to a just and accurate appreciation of the present situation, and it would be foolish to deny that the farmers who, after much trouble and expense, have succeeded in getting a substantial reduction of their rents, are anxious to immediately enter upon a new and vehement land campaign. The Arrears Act, according to the information available up to the time I am writing, is working fairly well, and will result in the discharge of a very large burden of debt from the shoulders of the tenantry. Putting all these facts together, one is justified, I think, in drawing the conclusion that the temper of a very large number, and probably of the majority, of the tenant farmers at the present moment is much more favorable to a policy of tranquillity than to one of fierce excitement.

I have gone through the various factors which make up the situation of the hour, and it will be well to here recapitulate the results:

(1.) The government is strong in England.

(2.) Its head is supreme in the House of Commons.

(3.) The new Rules have increased the control of the government, and diminished that of the Irish members, over the action of Parliament.

(4.) In Ireland, the government is armed with an absolutely complete system of coercion. And,

(5.) The majority of the tenants are not in a mood for the revival of vehement agitation.

We have reached these five conclusions by a process of reason-

ing which I think unassailable; but it is impossible not to sympathize with the fierce and instinctive resistance which such conclusions must excite in many minds, for, indeed, the condition of Ireland at the present moment is such as to excite in any Irishman of even ordinary sensibility some of that *sæva indignatio*, that fierce and burning wrath, which made welcome to one of the greatest of Irishmen the peace and silence of the tomb. It is but three years since the imminence of a famine in Ireland drew to that country the sympathy and the charity of nearly every land, and in an especial degree of that great nation in which these words will appear. In the interval, Ireland has passed through one of the fiercest and most powerful agitations that ever unsettled a country; she has been the target of the world's observation, and almost the sole topic of the English legislature; two measures have been passed that were declared by the authors to be the final settlement of the land question, and the pitiful result of it all is that, just as if nothing had occurred in the interval, the same cry is heard as in 1879, and the shadow of starvation once more stalks over several parts of the country. The situation is darker, too, than in 1879, in this: that the world has grown weary of the monotonous, doleful tale of Irish woes; that there are no longer the same ready sympathies to call upon, and that, besides, even if there were the same open purse-strings, there are no longer the men to make the same appeal; the pledge will remain unbroken that no appeal would ever again be made to the world on behalf of a starving Ireland. The consideration of this miserable state of things is aggravated by the reflection that none of this poverty need exist; that it is all an artificial malady, which evil legislation created and good legislation could cure. The districts in which this chronic poverty exists are overcrowded, but close beside are thousands of acres run waste, to which the tenants could be easily removed, and away in the midlands one can travel miles over grazing lands from which evil laws permitted the face of man to be swept away. Will any one contend that if such a problem as that which now faces the English Parliament at Westminster, and the English officials in Dublin Castle, were to confront a ministry of Irishmen, and a parliament in College Green, no solution would be found? The Irish cabinet which could find no better response to the exigencies of the hour than the lame and halting apologies of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Trevelyan, would not hold office for twenty-four hours, and would not deserve to hold it.

The startling statistics which are given in the Irish census just published prove, too, that the process of material decay is going on all over the country, and steadily, from decade to decade. In the ten years between 1871 and 1881 the inhabited houses have

fallen from 961,380 to 914,108. If we turn to the changes in the agricultural condition of the country, we find exactly the same story. "Between 1871 and 1881," says the *Freeman's Journal*, "the following gloomy decreases are tabulated, viz.: in tillage, 598,047 acres; in cereals, 90,675 acres; in potatoes and green crops, 203,141 acres; in flax, 9525 acres." And a more remarkable fact than the diminution in the number of houses, or of the land under cultivation, is the change that has come over the people in the matter of marriage. On this subject I again quote an article in the *Freeman's Journal:* "Of the more than a million and a half of marriageable men amongst us, on the census returns, 900,000, or much more than half, were single, bachelors, or widowers, the blissful husbands numbering only about 43 per cent. Of the more than a million and three-quarters of marriageable women and girls, only about 44 per cent. were wives, while over a million were either spinsters or widows."

It ought to be no matter of wonder, in the face of facts like these, that men of ardent, sensitive, and sanguine natures should demand that something should be done; but the practical statesman is obliged to ask what that something is. A moment's consideration of some of the plans proposed will show to any rational mind their utter impracticableness. It is said the farmers ought to be advised to pay no rent, or, as some persons put it, that the "No Rent" flag should again be unfurled. One would think that the Irish people had had an experience of a "No Rent" manifesto that would have induced any person, who desired to pass for a responsible or practical counsellor in Irish movements, to abstain from uttering the words for a considerable time to come. If any fact in history has been proved beyond dispute, it is the complete and disastrous breakdown of the "No Rent" manifesto of last year. Everybody who knows anything of the Land League movement knows that rent was paid almost universally after December of last year; that in the few districts where the manifesto was obeyed after that period, the poverty, and not the will of the tenant, produced the obedience the secret being either that the landlord would make no reduction, or that the tenant had no money, and that for a couple of months before the release of Mr. Parnell there were at one and the same time these three results of the "No Rent" manifesto: (1) The payment of more rent than at any period since the opening of the agitation; (2) An appalling increase in the number and the barbarity of agrarian crimes; and (3) An equally appalling and a geometrically progressive increase in the number of evictions. In other words, the "No Rent" manifesto had produced, as its triple offspring, increased crime, increased eviction, increased payment of rent. This is not the place to describe the masterly strategy by

which a situation of defeat so desperate was transformed into a victory, complete along the whole line; how Mr. Forster, from being the master of the position, was, in the twinkling of an eye, changed into a beaten and discredited minister; how the tenants were guaranteed relief from the overwhelming burden of old debts, which stood in the way of all hope for the future; how every point in the whole programme of the Land League was practically assured in the near future, and how—but for that fatal tragedy in Phœnix Park—the *prestige* of a triumph so complete in the battle for the land brought within visible proximity as complete a triumph in the battle for self-government. These things, which I have to set forth thus hurriedly in this place, I may be able to dwell upon at length on some future occasion, and to prove in every item by admitted facts and official figures. Suffice it for the present to say that the attacks which have been made upon the man by whose genius the great results, of which I have spoken, were achieved, open up hitherto undreamt-of and unrevealed depths of senselessness or malignity in Irish political controversy.

Returning to the proposal to remedy the present situation in Ireland by calling upon the farmers to pay no rent, I would ask this question: What farmers are to pay no rent? Is it the farmers in the distressed districts? Or, is it the general body of farmers? In either case, the advice is impracticable. Assuming that the farmers in the distressed districts would obey the advice—a large assumption—it may be doubted whether the withholding of the £2, £3, or £4 a year which they pay for their rent would of itself save them; for the root of their distress is not the largeness of their rent, but the smallness and barrenness of their holdings. If the intention is that the general body of farmers should pay no rent in order that those in the distressed districts may be saved, the assumption is necessary that the men who—I am not saying it in blame or by way of sarcasm—refused to face eviction for their own sake, will do so for the sake of somebody else.

But some one will say that arguments of a similar kind might have been employed against Mr. Parnell himself and Mr. Parnell's own action when, in 1879, Ireland stood in pretty much the same position as that in which she stands to-day. Are the men, it will be asked, who were extreme men in 1879 to pose to-day as moderate men? Objections like these bring into relief one of the difficulties of Irish politics, as perhaps of the politics of nearly every other country. This difficulty is the tyranny which is exercised over so many minds by mere phrases; and the confusion between terms that are absolute and terms that are relative. It ought not to be hard to prove that counsels which are wise at one period and under one set of circumstances may be foolish and even insane at

another time and under changed conditions. Mr. Parnell did, in 1879, tell the Irish farmers to withhold their rents, and did tell the Irish farmers to "keep a firm grip of their homesteads;" and events have proved the soundness of the advice. But the circumstances of 1879 and the circumstances of 1883 are in most respects entirely dissimilar. In 1879, there was no Coercion Act in any degree like the Coercion Act of 1882; above all things, the jury system then was representative of all classes of the people; and no impartial jury of his countrymen would convict Mr. Parnell of crime because he tried to save his countrymen from starvation. There was in 1879 a Conservative administration, and a Conservative administration is always kept in check in the work of coercion by a Liberal opposition. In 1879 there was no Land Act; and farmers who refused to pay their rent had not got their rack-rents considerably reduced; and above all, had not as they have now a valuable property in the shape of the tenant right of their farms, which the refusal to pay rent would forfeit. These are a few of the considerations which ought to convince any rational mind that there is no inconsistency in abstaining from giving in 1882 the same counsels which proved so successful in 1879.

All I have written up to the present is in the shape either of exposition or of criticism; and I acknowledge the duty in a writer of suggesting a policy in opposition to that which he cannot approve. Well, then, the first consideration which I would submit is that there are other questions as well as the land question; and that even the land question itself could be advanced indirectly by legislation, unconnected with the land, as well as by measures directly dealing with the tenure of the soil. Everybody knows, for instance, that if we succeeded in establishing self-government in Ireland, we would see, within a week after the meeting of the native Parliament, the introduction of a bill which would settle the land struggle for once and forever. Take the question of the franchise: if the franchise were reduced, scarcely a constituency would be left to the anti-popular party, and seventy or eighty national members might be trusted to compel even an English Parliament to meet every just demand of the Irish tenant. Or, take the question of county government: who can doubt that if the government of the counties were removed from the landlords to the representatives of the tenantry there would be in the hands of the people one more most powerful means for "elbowing" landlordism out of the country? Having mentioned these three questions, let me point out very briefly and rapidly how we stand in Ireland upon them.

Nothing shows more completely the utter hollowness of the pretence that England and Ireland are governed by equal laws than a comparison of the state of the franchise in the two countries.

On this point I cannot do better than quote from a fly-leaf published by Mr. Edmund Harvey, of the Grange, Waterford, which puts the matter very tersely and very clearly:

"In English boroughs, *all* rated householders (whose rates have been paid) are entitled to votes; also, by a late decision of English judges, nearly all lodgers will for the future be so entitled.

"In Irish boroughs, only rated householders whose houses are *valued by government* at *over* £4 per annum (equal to a yearly rental of £8 in Ireland, or £10 or £12 in England), and occupiers of lodgings worth 4*s.* per week (unfurnished), or over, are entitled to votes.

"As a consequence, Irish boroughs have less than half as many parliamentary voters, in proportion to population, as English boroughs.

"In English and Irish counties the occupiers' franchise is nominally the same (£12 government valuation), but from a difference in the methods of valuing, and other causes, English counties have more than one and a half times as many voters, in proportion to population, as Irish counties.

"Taking boroughs and counties together, *two* men out of *five* have hitherto had votes in England, whilst only *one* man in *five* has at present a vote in Ireland, for parliamentary purposes, so that, whilst English artisans can now practically rule the empire, Irish artisans are still, by law, almost entirely denied political influence."

If we turn to the municipal franchise in the two countries, we find the same glaring contrast. I again quote from Mr. Harvey:

"In England every person, *male* or *female*, who has occupied for twelve months any house rated to the poor, is entitled to the municipal franchise.

"In Ireland, every *man* only, who has occupied a house rated at *the government value of* £10 (equal to a rental of £17 in Ireland, or, say, £22 in England), is entitled to the municipal franchise.

"As a consequence, English towns have from *four* to *nine times* as many voters, for municipal purposes, as Irish towns."

Finally, with regard to the government of the counties, this is for all practical purposes entirely in the hands of the grand jury. They can order the construction of roads, appoint most of the county officials, assess the greater part of the taxation; and the grand jury consists exclusively of the landlords of the county.

There was a time—it is but a few years ago—when it was almost impossible to get any considerable body of Irishmen to take a strong interest in the reform of such scandalous abuses as these. It might tend to revive a controversy between honest and earnest men, who have since learned wise lessons by mutual respect

and toleration, if I were to furnish some of the causes which produced this apathy. Suffice it to say that, to the satisfaction, I think, of all sections of national Irishmen, this apathy is passing away, and in a year or two more will have completely disappeared. The example of Dublin will be enough to bring home to the minds of readers of this REVIEW the change that has come, in this respect, over all Ireland. It is but ten—nay, it is scarcely more than a year—since the corporation of Dublin was the embodiment of everything that is objectionable in the political and social life of Ireland to the Irishmen of spirit. Its members—with a rare exception—were either conservative Orangemen, or, as the popular term is in Ireland, "Cawtholic Whigs," and nowhere did strong national principles meet with a much chillier reception. It was but last year that this body, which had cheerfully conferred the freedom of the city on Mr. Gladstone, refused to grant the same favor to Mr. Parnell and Mr. Dillon, at the very moment when the ardor of their sympathy for the country had sent these gentlemen to jail, and in the very agony of an almost supreme struggle between all the resources of English brutality and of Irish patriotism. A few months after such a change had already been made in the composition of the corporation that the vote in favor of Mr. Parnell and Mr. Davitt was carried, and, at the last election, still further victories were gained. In wards where, but a few years ago, the most desperate efforts failed to oust pronounced Whigs, men have been returned of strong national opinions, and the state of parties in the corporation has been so transformed that at the present moment there are thirty-six Nationalists out of a total of, I believe, sixty members.

Let me pause, at this point, for a moment, to say that I regard the seizure, after the manner of the citizens of Dublin, of the local boards by a faction, of enormous importance in the immediate future of Ireland. It is important as regards the enemies, it is still more important as regards the people of Ireland themselves. First, as to the enemies of Ireland. Every Irishman knows that the truth, with regard to the real feelings of the Irish people, will be denied as long as it can decently or indecently be done; that English journals and English politicians will lie, or, at least, prevaricate and explain away to the last possible moment. And the worst part of the business is that it is English lies, and not Irish truth, that passes current among the peoples of the earth. As John Mitchell used to say, England has not only robbed Ireland, but has gained the ear of the world. The most palpable and potent remedy for this is, that the national conviction, which beats steady and unchangeable in the breasts of four out of every five Irishmen, should be expressed, symbolized, embodied in all the representative bodies of the country. National conviction should find itself

represented by a majority of national representatives in the Board of Guardians, in the Town Council, in the Harbor Board,—in any and every body or corporation over which the people have any control. Consider what an influence the success of such a policy would have, say, on the National question. Suppose the demand for the restoration of our national rights were backed up by a simultaneous vote in its favor from three out of four of all the Poor Law Boards, Town Boards, Harbor Boards, and all the other Boards throughout the country, not even the London *Times* or Mr. Herbert Gladstone could deny that behind the advocates of Irish self-government the Irish nation stood solid and united, and not all the mighty mountains of misrepresentation, which have been raised between the world and the real Ireland by English statesmen, and English literature, and English journalism, could any longer hide the truth from the eyes of all mankind; and when the world once really knows and understands our position, a great step is made towards the solution of our difficulties.

The capture of the local boards is most important for the sake of its influence on the Irish people themselves. There is a vulgar word, borrowed from the vocabulary of the betting ring, which I once heard so aptly applied to the Irish people, that I must repeat it. "The Irish people," I heard a gentleman once say, "require a good deal of 'backing.'" What he meant to convey was, that they were lacking, to some degree, in self-confidence, and that, until they reached to the self-confident temper, they did not make the full use of all the resources at their command. Most intelligent observers of the struggle of the last three years are agreed, I believe, in thinking that one of its permanent results is to do much towards the cultivation of the spirit of self-reliance among the Irish people. The lessons they have learned of the might that dwells in unity, combination, and determined action, will never probably pass away, and will, by-and-by, be one of the most effective allies of the champions of self-government. That spirit cannot but be largely increased when the people see their power, palpable and visible to their own eyes, in the shape of boards manned by representatives whom the people have elevated to their position. The fable of the horse and the man applies to the case of an enslaved and an enslaving nation. The great bulwark of slavery, more potent than battalions, or ironclads, or parliamentary majorities, is the slave's unconsciousness of his own strength.

It will be gathered from what I have written that in my opinion the reduction of the municipal and of the parliamentary franchise, county government, and one or two other measures of reform, would transform the whole face of Ireland, would enormously strengthen the popular forces, and would greatly accelerate the settlement of

the land and national questions. I am in favor, then, of these questions being pushed to the front, of their being earnestly and frequently discussed, and of their being forced on the attention of Parliament; and this brings me to the consideration—it must now be very rapid and brief—of our position with regard to these questions in the House of Commons. The present ministry is pledged breast-high to grant Ireland every one of the reforms I have mentioned, and it has actually introduced measures dealing with two of them; a bill for the reduction of the parliamentary franchise was introduced in the session of 1880, and a measure dealing with county government was mentioned in the Queen's speech—I think it was of 1881. I am not so simple as to suppose that promise of reform by a Liberal government and performance are one and the same thing, and I have not the most sanguine hopes as to our getting all or any of these measures from the present Parliament. The House of Commons is sick of the Irish question; English public opinion shares this feeling; and even if the popular chamber did pass a poor Irish measure, Lord Salisbury and his creatures in the House of Peers could reject it in the confident feeling that there was no strong popular feeling in its support among the English constituencies. Our chances are best on the franchise question. The present ministry is determined not to leave office until it has brought in a measure for the reduction of the franchise in the English counties, and it is not easy to see how it could have the face to propose such a change in the franchise of England without at the same time proposing a similar change in the franchise of Ireland.

The sentences which I have just written will show that I do not take a too roseate view of our parliamentary prospects for the next couple of years. I would desire to suggest a moral to the Irish people from the state of their fortunes in this regard, and the moral is that they should turn their eyes away from the present hour and direct them to the future. The next couple of years ought to be a period of preparation, of energetic work, of regular organization. It is a trite complaint that it is not easy to get the Irish people to politically labor when times are tranquil, and persistency or drudgery is the chief requirement. The complaint is not altogether just; for though there may be many difficulties peculiar to Irish political struggles, there are others which pursue the representatives of the people, from which the Irish cause is almost entirely free. Our people, whatever may be their faults, have earnestness of soul and persistence of purpose; one never sees among them an abandonment of popular leaders and of the popular side, such as I have adverted to in the case of Mr. Gladstone and the English constituencies; and the Irish constituencies, as a body, are prepared to vote for the right man whenever they

get a fair chance. I have already sketched out a plan of campaign for local struggles, and I am strongly of opinion that the sooner the campaign for the parliamentary seats is entered upon the better. Before the end of the next six months there ought to be no popular constituencies which ought not to have selected the candidate for whom it intends to stand when the period of election comes.

I should not conclude without saying a few words as to the position and prospects of the present Parliamentary party. Any words I may devote to this part of my subject lay me, I am afraid from past experience, open to grave misapprehension. A journal, for instance, of great ability, good sense, and honesty, recently interpreted a comparison which I ventured to make in an address to my constituents between the different sections of constitutional agitators, as a contrast between parliamentary and extra-parliamentary parties. Members of the Irish party, too, have been accused of an attempt to set up a contest between the work which they do on the floor of the House of Commons, and that which can be done by extra-parliamentary speakers and by the people themselves on the soil of Ireland itself. It is quite probable that members of Parliament do not wholly escape the tendency of every man to make the most of his own work; but he must be a fool who does not recognize that the real strength of the Irish party in the House of Commons is not their own personal qualities, but the position they hold in the confidence of their countrymen. The reason why the followers of Mr. Shaw have ceased to be considered, while those of Mr. Parnell are counted with our political forces, is that the one section has to be representative of Irish opinion, while the Irish people are known to stand behind the other. I will not venture to predict that the Irish party will continue to retain the same strong hold upon the minds of the people which they have at present. I do not want—especially at the close of an already lengthy article—to enter upon a new subject of controversy; and I must content myself with the assertion that the destruction of the influence of that party ought, in my humble judgment, be deemed a national misfortune, alike by those who believe in the all-sufficiency of constitutional agitation, and by those who, caring little for us constitutionalists, believe that honest Irish representatives are doing good work in the present stage of national development.

It would be vain to blink the fact that serious perils face the Irish party at the present hour. They have in the past represented a powerful, wealthy, and widespread organization, and every victory that was gained by the Land League brought its share of prestige to them. Now they are just bringing into existence a

new organization, which cannot make appeals to passions so strong, or interests so large and direct as those that were appealed to by the old league. In Ireland they are face to face with a coercion code that renders fierce agitation impossible, and there cannot, therefore, be a repetition of those dramatic episodes, fierce conflicts, imprisonment, and all those other exciting events which do so much to sustain a popular agitation. They have strong and dangerous enemies, within and without. On the one side, appeals will be made to a consistency and monotony of moderation that would be just as fatal, and in many circumstances, just as irrational, as a monotony of violence; on the other side, vague demands will be made by restless, or self-seeking, or thoughtless counsellors, for the adoption of wild and impracticable courses. To steer between these two extremes will not be easy; it will not be easy to avoid, at the same time, the dry-rot of inaction, and the mortal fever of irrational action; to escape at the same time from the Scylla of Whiggery, and the Charybdis of uncalculating violence. But the Irish party should look with confidence to three great weapons of defence. First, they should ask the honest and sympathetic appreciation of the Irish race at home and abroad; second, they should never dread being rational; and, third, they should stand loyally and immovably by the leadership of Mr. Parnell. Up to the present, we have every reason to believe that our countrymen will be at least just to us, and that secures to us the first bulwark of our position. Secondly, the bitter warnings we have received against pliancy to noise and unreason ought to secure every Irish representative in the future against the dread of speaking out sense to the people. And, finally, the leadership of Mr. Parnell still stands on foundations as firm as the position of any leader of men at the present hour. On this last point let the last words of this article be spoken. The importance of Mr. Parnell to the Irish cause can be fully appreciated, perhaps, by those only who are a little behind the scenes. I have no hesitation, nor has any one of my colleagues in whose judgment the Irish people have confidence any hesitation, in saying that he is the only man whose personal qualities are a secure guarantee for the continued union of the Irish members. Able as are many of the men around him, he is the only one whose superiority is acknowledged without question and without grudge. To the people outside he gives the rallying-cry, by a trusted, a single, and a comprehensive name; and history has been studied in vain by every one who does not know that in political struggles political forces are enormously strengthened by the embodiment of principles in an individual leader. The suggestion that Mr. Parnell's position can be assailed

and weakened without injury to the Irish cause is as rational as the supposition that French soldiers fought as well under Bazaine as under the first Napoleon, or that an arch can stand when the keystone is removed.

CHURCH ARCHITECTURE IN THE UNITED STATES.

ITS DIFFICULTIES, ITS FAULTS, ITS NEEDS, AND THE REMEDY.

IN its accomplishments and in its possibilities architecture partakes of the nobility of its main source of inspiration. Had it been limited to the needs of mere utility, it would not have attained a high position among the arts. Had its aim been to meet only the common wants of man, it would never have become a noble art. Neither imperial palaces nor other civic buildings of great cities could have supplied the motive needed for sublime effort. In all ages, if not among all nations, religion has been the fitting and only true incentive; and, because of religion architecture has reared its grandest and most successful works. Religion caused uncivilized races, despite the rudeness of their arts, to form for the worship of their gods something worthy of admiration; it incited the early Egyptians to build temples which awaken our awe; it made the earliest Hindoos carve out of the natural rock, with slow, painful labor, elaborately ornamented buildings; it induced the Greeks to rear beautiful structures and the Romans to raise stately edifices; and it constructed for Christian Europe the lofty, decorative cathedrals, which are the noblest material works of impassioned genius. The highest aspiration of man is the worship of a Supreme Being; and, in obedience to that aspiration, man has created architectural works stupendous and sublime. Temples, synagogues, churches, and cathedrals are the tributes of finite beings to an Infinite Being; and, in their nature such tributes ought to have honest work and to avoid baleful sham.

Architecture has been defined "the art of ornamental and ornamented construction." The definition is logical, and not merely convenient; for a building may have an ornamental construction without being ornamented, or it may be ornamented without having an ornamental construction. In a Greek temple, the proportions

of length to breadth and of height to length and breadth, the arrangement of the porticoes, and the disposition of the peristyle belong to ornamental construction. In a Gothic cathedral, the ornamental construction is the proportion of length to breadth, the projection of the transepts, the different heights of the nave and of the aisles, and the disposition and the proportion of the towers. Even without ornament, an ornamental construction is beautiful. A building may be as devoid of ornament as a granary; but if the disposition of parts be good, as in the case of the older English abbeys, it is always pleasing, and, when large, it is imposing as an architectural work. When elegant ornament that is appropriate is added to an ornamental construction, the building takes rank with the great works of architecture. In a house for worship ornament without ornamental construction is a degrading deceit. The art which produces it is bad and has a bad effect upon the worshipers. When discovered, hypocrisy excites our disgust and causes a revulsion of feeling. Deceit in construction or in ornament is a lie in stone, in metal, in wood, in putty, or in plaster; but it is a hurtful lie, which is sure to be discovered and sure to excite contempt.

The principles of good architecture are not arbitrary; but they are the outgrowth of the study of means to an end. If they demand exact proportions, special materials for special purposes, and suitable treatment for the materials, these demands cannot be neglected without insecurity, without risk, and without deceit. At first sight, non-professional Americans may not know the difference between good and bad proportions, between stone and plaster which is made to look like stone, between marble and wood which is painted to look like marble; but after a while they will feel the difference, and in the end will suffer from the sham, if not from the peril of weak, fire-inviting roof or walls and the flame-food of putty ornament. The effect of bad, unworthy work is quicker and greater upon foreigners, even of the emigrant classes, who, being accustomed to the honest work of older countries, know the difference in stability and are hurt by the gairish deceptions of construction and of material. If sham be justifiable in churches erected to a God, why may not shams in our houses, in our furniture, and in our dress be defended? The preacher may decry sham and its vanity; but it must be with little effect if his pulpit, his altar, and his building be dishonest work and made to seem better than they are.

The quick increase of population in our large cities has necessarily multiplied churches of all creeds. Cathedrals are happily of slow growth, and consequently are likely to be relatively well constructed; but smaller churches spring up like fungi, though, unfor-

tunately, not as well suited for their ends. Pretentious plans make bad work. A church ought not to try to rival a cathedral; yet rivalry, vain imitation, and lack of both means and purpose make many of the churches glittering, insecure, unholy shams. The money that is wasted in spoiling European Gothic models would be sufficient to erect substantial symmetrical buildings worthy of their purpose; and yet the pointed style, the noblest order of architecture and the best outcome of Catholic influence, is improperly blamed for these bad, dishonoring counterfeits. The Gothic style has been sadly influenced by the modern Renaissance, which is a debased ornate style. True art never inclines to over-decoration. The hankering fondness for the ornate, or over-decorated, modern Gothic, which is by no means the best Gothic, has been the cause of much useless extravagance and of much dishonest work. In a new country new churches are needed; but it is not wise that every congregation should attempt a vast and lofty building. The propriety of ecclesiastical architecture requires that the churches should be as great as the means of those erecting them will permit; but the spirit of Christian architecture is imperious in its proper demand that there shall be no deception, no trickery. A building that is a trick and a lie might be used for a shop, for a theatre, or for a music hall; but it ought not to be used for the worship of a truth-loving God. Architectural lies in wood, in plaster, or in putty are not in the end cheap anywhere; but in churches they are as expensive as they are opposed to the spirit of religion.

Hurry is an evil of the country; and the hurry of church building makes dishonoring and expensive work. Before the cost is known, even to the architect, some churches are finished. If the plans and the designs be properly selected, the cost can be determined before the work is begun; and the style of building which honesty ought to choose need not exceed the means of the congregation. It is as wrong for a congregation to attempt too much in a church as it is for a man to build a dwelling-house beyond his means. Unless for a stated case, it is impossible to tell what is "too much." A church's future, it is thought, is longer and better than that of a private building, and thus justifies a proportionately greater risk; but in the common practice of "discounting the future," the prospective income of a new church in the United States seems likely to be rather extravagantly than properly computed. For any congregation that undoubtedly is too much which would entail an oppressive debt; but how difficult it is to determine correctly the prospective income, the corroding, hopeless debts of some expensive churches proclaim. A church ought to be better, more beautiful, and grander than a dwelling-house;

and it may be such, and the cost need not exceed the means, if the style be appropriate, and the construction and ornamentation be honestly simple. So great is the hurry to build, however, that churches are undertaken when the money is not sure; and long delays, deaths or removals of principals, and a dangerous system of obtaining money by mortgages make bad work and increase the cost beyond wisdom, propriety, or usefulness. Obtaining money by mortgage is often a method opposed to true economy. The borrower soon learns that the greater the cost of the proposed building the greater the amount which may be borrowed thereon; and this fact commonly becomes a strong temptation to incur greater expense. Before the church is begun the cost might be known and limited, with the results of honest appropriate construction and a building free from trick, free from sham, and, perhaps, free from debt.

The architect is not by profession a capitalist, and he cannot furnish both plans and means. He plans and builds as required and when required; but he never is a principal. Misplaced economy often reduces his pay to a gross amount which is insufficient to secure his proper supervision of the work. If a percentage be allowed, it is often so unwisely small that it is only natural that he should not be pained by an increase in the cost of the church. The parsimony which denies proper pay to the architect is fatal. If poverty prick him he has to consent, though he may respect his art, to many a change and many a deceit which he knows to be unworthy and in the end costly. In order to satisfy the principal's or the building committee's demand to make the greatest show for the money to be expended, he is often compelled to do what he knows is not good or right. The counterfeits and the tricks which he is thus forced to adopt may sorrowfully disgust him; and, in some cases, do drive him from the profession, when happily he has other means of a livelihood.

The so-called economy which does not seek to know or to limit the cost of the proposed church, yet which pinches the architect, grows bolder and more reckless as the walls become higher; and tricky, dangerous, but always showy, subterfuges are adopted in the vain hope of saving money. The imitation which "looks just as well" as the real is not truly cheap, even if it were not unworthy in a church; but, in the pseudo-classical styles, we find plaster columns and pilasters, plaster architraves, plaster friezes, plaster cornices, plaster balusters, and plaster sills; and in the Gothic, plaster columns, plaster arches, wooden columns with plaster capitals supporting plaster arches, plaster vaults, plaster ribs, plaster cusps, and plaster crockets are everywhere used. Inasmuch as they need the same designing by the architect as though they were

of stone, they are expensive; and they are as fragile as they are dishonest. To make even such unarchitectural counterfeits much labor is needed and at a cost of money which ought to be applied otherwise for safety. All such deceptive things are in opposition to the first principles of construction and of decoration, as well understood by Pagans as by Christians. The underlying rules of good taste in art are that a thing ought to be what it seems, and that a material ought not to be used for a purpose for which it is unfitted. These are rules of polite life; and they are rigorously applied by polite society to the matter of dress, as well as to houses and to furniture. If deceptions in our houses may not be defended, are deceptions in the churches of the living God defensible? Plaster forms made to look like stone are intended to deceive. It is the use of an unfit material; for, unless as a coating for walls, plaster in a church is a mean deception and an architectural absurdity.

Probably every large city in the United States and in Canada has churches which are not only architectural absurdities but expensive shams. It is difficult to find a church wholly free from unworthy deception in construction or in decoration. The cost of these buildings, which are as unstable as they are dishonest, is enormous and often out of proportion to the revenue. The extravagance in expenditure is not for convenience, for security, for stability, for ventilation, or for good lighting; but it is for pretentious façades, for inartistic wall decoration, for badly-colored glass, for ornaments of deceptive plaster, and for tricks of paint. The money goes for some kind of gaudy ornament, which, even if well made, is not necessary and may not be advisable. A church should not have parts which are not necessary for convenience, for construction, or for propriety; and yet architectural features are loosely added to our churches with which the added features can have no connection. All ornament ought to be an enrichment of the essential construction of the building; and yet ornaments are often built up in an isolated way, instead of forming the decoration of construction. In modern churches, from floor to nave-roof and from façade to apse-wall, there is not a part which may not be a violation of the laws already given; and all violations are shams, expensive, belittling, and unworthy. However simple, honest work in a church ought to be as much a matter of obligation as it is more worthy than any unrelated gilded deception. In churches, the violations of the rules of good taste are more absurd than would be the fastening of an imitation gold watch-chain to the Apollo of the Vatican, or of a paste-diamond garter to the Venus de Medici.

The façades of churches are often the best work, but are always very costly and sometimes deceptive. If there be any honesty

about the building, it is likely to be in the façade; and many façades are unquestionably good in design and in work. A proper front ought to express the character of the church and to define the building; but it ought not to be a deceptive screen, with unpractical doors and wider or higher than the building. A false façade is a false face. Even if such a front were not needlessly expensive, no depraved taste can ever make it excusable that a building erected to God should seem larger and better than it is. When the façade is not false, it may be pretentious and partly dishonest work. Even as to its tracery, the common wheel-window is of wood, sometimes painted, but usually sanded. In construction, curved forms of arch and of tracery are unsuitable for wood and adapted only to stone. Wood has to be bent and held by concealed means; but stone can be so shaped and jointed that its own weight is the fastening. If the wooden window and wooden tracery, with mouldings proper only to stone, be merely painted, it is the wrong use of material; but if they be sanded to look like stone, it is an intentionally dishonest treatment. The façade frequently has one or two towers. If the tower be of stone, the spire is commonly of wood sanded to look like stone; and thus the deception is carried up to the finial. If a spire straddle the roof, a few feet back of the pediment, as may be seen in small towns, it is an absurdity; for it is made to look like stone, which the roof could not support. When there is need of economy, the expense of towers for city churches might be saved; for the bells which they are constructionally intended to carry are now of no need in proclaiming the hour of service, and are little used for chiming, tolling, or warning. A tower not intended for bells must be architecturally and economically a foolish extravagance. False, dishonest, or with purposeless parts, the façade is always expensive, using money which might better be spent for strengthening the walls and the roof. A wall and a roof well-constructed are better than any ornamented front. If an honest façade cannot be afforded, it would be everyway better to omit it. It is not necessary to have it; but in this country even the safety of the building is endangered and mean cheap deceptions stain all the interior in order to save money for an ostentatious façade. In Europe many a church of honest construction was built and used without a front; and subsequently, and only when the money needed for honest work was at command, was the omission supplied. The church of Sta. Maria dei Fiori, the cathedral of Florence, one of the largest and finest churches of the Middle Ages, was begun about 1298 and finished about 1444; but until 1876 no successful attempt was made to build the front. Without a façade and despite its extremely simple interior, the honest grandeur of its conception and execution made

it a wonder of architecture during nearly five hundred years. In the same city, the smaller church of Sta. Croce, called the Pantheon of modern Italy, was begun in 1294 and completed in 1442; but the façade was not attempted until 1857. Slow of growth is everything good. The churches free from deceit were built part by part; but they were used, and were honorably fit for use, long before they were completed. In the honestly constructed churches, which alone are suited for the worship of a God, the priests' voices alternated with the music of the masons' chisels; and the alternation, as long as it was necessary, was not inappropriate, irreverent, or accessory to sham.

The clerestory, through which the lighting of Gothic churches is effected, is commonly two tall, but dangerously thin, walls, with an interior coating of plaster, sometimes colored to imitate stone. These walls are frequently so thin and so weak as to need —what fortunately the fire-laws compel—an exterior covering of slate or of galvanized iron. Built in the flimsiest and cheapest manner, they are barely fitted to carry the roof; and, like the weak, tricky, plaster triforium beneath, are neither secure nor fire-proof. Indeed, they have to be flimsy, by reason of the cheap deceptive supports, consisting of wooden columns, sanded to look like stone, and plaster capitals, or of wooden posts made by wooden mouldings and sand to look like stone piers. The windows in such a clerestory are often as flashy and vulgar as elaborate and deceptive wooden mouldings and the poorest of colored glasses can make them. Bad, unworthy, unsuitable, and dangerous as is all this sham work, it is relatively high-priced. Unworthy work ought not to find a place in a church; and undoubtedly it ought to be avoided in favor of walls that are stable.

The nave-ceiling, in many of our churches, is groined, or divided into compartments by means of ribs springing from caps or corbels, and uniting in the centres of the compartments, or vaults. It is the glory of Christian architecture that, at great heights and across vast spaces, lofty vaults of stone may be thrown from the supports of slender shafts. It is an ornamental construction, admitting enrichment by ornament; but neither groining nor other vaulting is adapted to anything else than to stone or to brick construction. In any of our vaulted churches the observer looks up at vaults, not of stone, but of counterfeiting plaster or cement. A counterfeit vault would be an absurdity, even if, in a house of God, it were not an irreverent deception. The better the plaster be disguised, the more apparent the absurdity; for it is contrary to reason that thin weak walls could carry the great weight of stone vaults. If the carrying piers and the walls be of stone, then the plaster-vaulting is not only a cheap trick for a church, but is without the excuse of insuffi-

cient support. In a cathedral a stone ceiling is essential, both for durability and for security from fire; and it is advisable for conveyance of sound. Dishonest work increases the danger of conflagration. The roofs of some of the great cathedrals of France have been wholly burned, but the strength of the stone-vaulting saved the interiors. To the lack of a stone ceiling many great churches owe their destruction by fire. This explains why, in this country, so few churches take fire without being wholly destroyed. The effort to do something beyond our means makes many a church bad in construction, and causes the inexcusably dishonest use of plaster capitals on moulded marble piers and a cement ceiling on supports intended to carry stone groining. It would be honest work if the capitals were uncut blocks of stone, to be carved subsequently when the church could afford it. Such uncut capitals, awaiting sufficient money for completion, are to be seen in some good churches of Europe; and the rough stone is thought to be reverently honest work and far better than the unworthy trick of plaster lies.

The altar ought to be of the same style, period, and nationality as the church. The showiest Gothic altars frequently are erected at great expense in churches of the Romanesque or of the Renaissance style. In a Gothic church the altar, when Gothic, is often of a style belonging to an earlier or to a later period than the style of the church; or the altar and the building differ as to their nationality, as when a German Gothic altar is erected in a French Gothic church. This impropriety comes from carelessness, as often as from ignorance, but never from economy. The use of naked lights, artificial flowers, and hangings makes it necessary for security that the altar, and even the platform, be of stone. This fact and the wish to make a show give rise to another deception, and unworthy work unintentionally desecrates the altar. A wooden altar, trickily painted to look like marble, rests upon a wooden platform, which is concealed by a carpet. If the lower part of the altar be of marble, carved and panelled, the upper part, designed for marble, is often a sham of wood; and the lack of harmony is ignorantly, but absurdly, emphasized by paint and by gilding. Designs, too, intended only for metal, are partly or wholly carried out in gilded wood. Far more honest and far less costly would be some simple altar of stone, designed for stone, than such a panelled, carved, turreted, and crocketed altar, half truth, half lie, and wholly displeasing. If freestone be found to be too costly, there can be no objection, on the side of art or of honesty, to an altar of wood, however simple; provided it be treated as wood, and honestly proclaim itself to be wood. The dishonesty lies not in the use of wood, which may be merely the necessity of a pres-

ent poverty, but in making the wood look to be what it is not. When in good taste and honestly made, a new altar of marble may be an unwise expenditure, if it is to be placed in an insecure building; and the not uncommon contradiction is a misuse of money that ought to have been applied to making the church secure, if not fireproof. A large church usually has more than one altar; and then the deceptions, the tricks, the extravagance, and the waste are multiplied. Being afterthoughts, these side-altars are often placed like furniture in a show-room, and not in recesses, which should have been marked in the plan of the building. If the railed space in front of the high altar and forming the sanctuary be sufficiently large to permit of the beautiful ceremonies which have to be attempted, the furniture of the sanctuary is commonly out of harmony with the style of the church, or even of the altar. In Gothic churches, in which the furniture is more likely to correspond, ornaments, like cusps and crockets, are sometimes of plaster or of putty, painted to look like carved wood. All these make-believe marbles or metals and all the other deceptions, are as expensive as they are frail; and, even if they were economical, they are harshly inappropriate for an altar and for a sanctuary.

The wall decorations, demanding the most careful expenditure of money, are a source of painfully unwise outlay and, nearly always, of æsthetically dishonest and deceptive work. Elaborate or simple, interior decoration is not necessary; but, if the revenue permit it to be done, the decoration ought to be according to an artistic scheme and to be limited to the means. In the United States and in Canada the interior decoration of churches is everywhere attempted; and yet it is generally a matter of debt, of chance, of patchwork, of incongruous designs, and very rarely is according to a scheme. A scheme requires that all the interior parts that ought to have a color decoration be treated as to line and color after the design of a competent artist; and that his design be conceived with relation to the architecture and the lighting of the building.[1] The use of line and of color is to please the eye; but that it can never do by counterfeiting stone or wooden mouldings. If a wall, which every one knows to be a flat surface, be painted to represent colonnades, arcades, or porticoes, with attempted light and shade effects, it is an absurdity, because contrary to reason. Perspective in wall-painting is of questionable propriety. As to the use of human figures in relief, the examples of the great masters leave the question of propriety still debatable; but it is not debatable,

1 The apse of St. Thomas's Church, of New York city, and the whole of Trinity Church, of Boston, are good instances. The artist is a Catholic; the churches, Protestant. The decoration of St. Thomas's had to be treated for gaslight effect, as the construction of the building and the arrangement of the windows are such that sunlight sufficient for day-effect is impossible.

that poor imitations of the old masters' designs are in bad taste and expensive. Wall decoration, if it be honest, must be in grounds of harmonious—not stone-counterfeiting—tints, to be relieved by geometric patterns, or by other flat forms that cannot lie. Much of the present decoration is intended to deceive; as, when the only sill-moulding of a practical window is a painted one, or when a counterfeit window is painted where a window could not be placed, or when the plaster walls are painted to imitate ashlar. Such tricks may be permissible upon the theatrical stage; but in a church, even if they were not costly, they are contrary to sincere religion as well as to art. If the walls must be decorated, such expensive deceptions are not necessary; for the use of colored bricks forms a simple and honest means of interior decoration, and marble slabs or enamelled tiles, if dear, would at least be durable and not require renewal, like any decoration upon plaster. In point of injudicious use of money, the paintings are generally worse than the frescoes. Church paintings ought to be the work of undoubted artists, or they ought not to be attempted; but, usually, they are done by some cheap workman, more ambitious than able, and the result is disfigurement, dissatisfaction, and useless expense. Such paintings cannot excite devotion; but they cause distraction by teaching artistic, historical, and theological absurdities. The few American Catholic artists are not encouraged to picture devotional subjects, or to study Christian art. The foreign stencillers and the copiers of affected designs have surely spoiled sufficient wall surface; and it is full time to make a change. It would be far better, and true economy, to let the interior remain undecorated, as in many a European church, until sufficient money be obtained and the proper artist be found to make the interior harmoniously beautiful. A church without interior decoration or painting may be coldly severe; but still it may be grand in its proportions, imposing by its size and strength, and honest and honorable in its construction. The amount of money hastily, inartistically, and foolishly spent for frescoes and paintings is not in keeping with the parsimony that builds weak walls and dishonest ceilings, and endangers life and property. This so-called economy makes an observer believe that, were it not for our building laws, our churches would be built more insecurely, though decorated more gaudily, than other buildings.

The pews, the candelabra, the gas fixtures, the statues, and the organ offer chances—rarely avoided—for extravagance, deception, and inharmonious designs. As to material, the pews of today generally are what they seem to be; but the many needless, inartistic mouldings and carvings make them very costly without making them suitable, comfortable, or ornamental. Imi-

tations of bronze or of brass, and in styles different from that of the church, often make the candelabra and the gas-fixtures as painful as they are tawdry and expensive. Bad as may be the statues, they are never cheap; but the cheaper they are, the poorer and the less desirable they are. It often happens that their use is a violation of propriety; for, like the side altars, they are not provided for in the plans of most churches, so that they have to stand upon brackets fastened anywhere, and to look like trade objects in a neglected shop. Plaster statues are sculptural absurdities; but, like other absurdities and deceptions, they are to be found in every city. Imported from bad foreign workshops, they are often expensively and inartistically colored and gilded, without any knowledge of the style of the church or of the surroundings. When in place, sometimes better judgment goes to still further expense—which ought not to have been necessary—to paint them all white; and the poor plaster forms are made to counterfeit marble and to look like uneasy ghosts, fearless of dust, but fearful of some new desecration of color. The statues upon altars in honor of saints are usually as inartistic as the commonest trade figures; yet their gilding and colors make them costly without making them devotional. Statues are not necessary; but, if they be used, they ought to be good and honest. When art and economy are aided by the absence of statues, both may be injured by the organ. In city churches there seems to be a rivalry to have a showy, big-sounding organ, with as many stops as that at Freiburg has; but there is little concern that it should be within the means, in accordance with the worth of the building, or its face in harmony with the style of the church. A great organ is no more necessary for every church than is a spire three hundred feet high; and it may happen that the organ is relatively worth more than the building, and, like a grand piano in a faulty barn, sure of destruction by fire, or of injury by rain through the cheaply-constructed roof.

A lack of unity and a poverty of design in churches are to be seen everywhere. The lack of unity of design must be referred either to carelessness or to ignorance. It is not unusual to find the exterior and interior elevations of one style, the glass decoration of another style, the high altar of a third, the side altars of a fourth, and the pulpit and pews of a fifth. Instead of being made to agree with the design of the architect, the designs of the marble-worker, of the metal-worker, of the wood-carver, and of the carpenter, are spiritless copies of book drawings and differ as much as the workmen. The poverty of design, shown by the tiresome repetitions of exterior and of interior elevations, may come from insufficient study on the part of the architects, who, limiting their work to

their narrow pay, may find it easier and quicker to adapt the same form and design to varying dimensions than to create new designs.

Tricky, dishonest, insecure work disgraces and weakens almost all our churches, Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant; and the preceding statements are based upon an impartial examination. In some the tricks are few; but in many deceptive and bad, still always expensive, work creeps from foundation to spire finial. If the money expended be considered, the Protestant churches in the large cities make a good display; but some of the most costly are as bad as unwise expenditure of money could make them. Economically, the Catholic churches are, in general, failures; and, architecturally, a few are good, and the many are very bad, but not more so than are the many churches of other creeds. In point of honest construction and, occasionally, even of decoration, the Jewish temples and synagogues are commendable work; but some are offensive and not one is wholly free from the evils of the day and of the country. All these churches teach one great lesson worth the learning: that extravagant outlay is almost always for so-called ornament, and not for construction. The construction, not the ornament, is essential; but the practice of the day would seem to be that the ornament, not the construction, is important. The tricks, the shams, and the dishonest work have become so common that few clergymen question the propriety or doubt the worthiness; and yet, if clergymen or building committees undertake the construction of a church, are they not morally obliged to bring to their work the necessary fitness or knowledge? The laws of honest work, alone worthy of their God's church, and the laws of taste proper to a house of God, ought to be known to them; otherwise they are unfitted for the trust, and the consequent dishonest work is sure to make foolish the expenditure. A knowledge of the elementary laws of architecture and of taste is not intuitive; but it must be acquired by those needing to use it, if worthy work and prudent outlay be important. The common law does not compel an ignorant fisherman, for example, to build a steamship; but, if he assume the supervision of the work, the law will hold him responsible, even though he plead ignorance of construction. The negotiator between the congregation that furnishes the money and the architect that plans and builds is morally responsible for the bad work and useless expense following the meddlesome, culpable ignorance of primary laws. If an honest architect be chosen—and it is to be supposed no other will be employed—his judgment ought to command the respect of the non-professional agent. When the agent is the pastor there is no reason to suspect his intention to do right; but it is to be remembered that his executive

position demands knowledge as well as good will. When he calls beautiful a church that constructionally, is a sham and æsthetically is a deceit, the people may reverently assent; but his costly ignorance is not therefore excusable, or the building either secure or honorable. Whoever he be, the agent ought to have the needed knowledge; for then, and only then, can he fittingly and safely and thriftily advise, interfere, or order.

Churches here are built under circumstances different from those in Europe. There they have been built by cities' orders, or by gifts of princes, prelates, and private purses, as well as by willing contributions of the people: in the United States they are built mainly by a severe tax upon the poor. Here government or city aid is improbable; we have no princes, the prelates are not wealthy, and the rich men are not disposed to build monuments in the form of churches. The few Protestant churches that have been erected by large gifts from private purses are only exceptions to the common custom. Pastor, building-committee, and architect ought to reflect whence is to come the needed money. The architect alone can do nothing, on account of the wish of pastor and of congregation to surpass their neighbors and to equal foreign churches; yet pastors and people ought to learn that which, under the present circumstances, is not only morally necessary, but which forms the basis of mere "mercantile" honesty. In the condition of thought in the United States there is, too, a difference and a change which demand earnest consideration by clergymen. Freedom of speech permitting every cobbler to be a public lecturer upon theology; the freedom of the press, which treats of every subject, even the holiest; and the free-school education, giving even polite knowledge to the poorest, make it necessary that the churches, also, should become schools of instruction, gratuitously imparting fuller knowledge and wiser guidance than are to be had elsewhere. If church-goers hear two sermons each Sunday, they do not hear as much religion as they every day may read of science, of art, of literature, of history, of scandal, in the pages of the newspaper, of the magazine, of the review, and of cheap books. With the present method, which is the old one, sufficient for the needs of a people three hundred years ago, the amount of given religious instruction, relatively to other kinds of instruction, is absurdly small. In numbers and in ability the secular press is far ahead of the religious; and in quantity, in quality, and in cheapness, the religious publications are far behind the profane. The "conflict" is unequally waged; and every day makes it more important that the inequality be not mistaken for inability.

The remedy for the present faults and needs of American churches

is that the buildings should be of some simple plan, so that they may be all that they seem to be; and that they be made to contain the multitude, to whom religion may be taught as fully as are other matters elsewhere. In growing cities very expensive and not proportionately commodious churches are built for districts which the subsequent increase of population requires to be divided; and the division makes necessary new churches. It is important that this division be foreseen; and that simpler, more commodious churches be erected, the multiplication of which may not be an offence against economy or architecture. The preaching order churches of the Middle Ages—simple in plan and simple in construction—ought to furnish the needed suggestion; for they have been religiously successful, and are architecturally honest.[1] For the ordinary churches the best plan, then, would be to go back to a simple building of a great nave, not divided into aisles to be shown in the façade, and without shafts or clerestory; but with solid walls carrying a timber roof honestly showing its construction and treated after the tasteful manner of the Romanesque or the Gothic decoration. A timber roof is not fireproof, but it is good and relatively inexpensive; and, when it is not concealed by a plaster ceiling, it may be moulded, carved, or simply decorated so as to be a thing of constructional beauty. With timber great height may be attained, and great distance spanned by means of a single spar reared on its base or supported at the ends, strength being obtained by bracing the pieces together according to geometric principles. Of such wooden roofs, there are many beautiful and astonishing examples in the churches of England of the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries. The proposed plan of building would reject the unsightly, deceptive, or dangerous galleries, from which no view of the altar can be had; and it would give abundant wall space for suitable frescoes and devotional paintings, when sufficient means and good artists could be secured. For the exterior brick might be used. In Italy and in the Low Countries, brick has been employed with results satisfactory to art as well as to economy. With terra cotta, properly applied, or with stone, it is relatively inexpensive, very pleasing, full of character, and more lasting than many of the costly freestones used here; but it ought to be tried only by those who understand its limitations. Some of the new buildings of New York city are examples of what may be

[1] Ruskin, speaking of the Franciscans and the Dominicans, says, in "Mornings in Florence:" "Their churches were meant for use; not show, nor self-glorification, nor town-glorification. They wanted places for preaching, prayer, sacrifice, burial; and had no intention of showing how high they could build towers, or how widely they could arch vaults. Strong walls and the roof of a barn,—these your Franciscan asks of his Arnolfo. These Arnolfo gives,—thoroughly and wisely built."—*I. Santa Croce*, p. 14.

done with brick and terra cotta, though not equal to the admirable use of the same materials in the churches of Italy. For economy the façade ought to be plain; but it need not, therefore, be unattractive. How beautiful may be a very simple façade is shown in some of the older English and French churches. Be the exterior what it may, the interior is more important. The suggested plan would give an unbroken space which would accommodate more persons than many of our most costly churches, obstructed as they are by large columns or by larger piers, and darkened by galleries and aisle vaults. Such a building would be economical and could be well ventilated and well lighted. It would be simple; and all good art must be simple. It would be architecturally honorable, and could be imposing by reason of its proportions and of its simplicity; but it would not be an object of undue expense, of unsuitableness, of trickery, of distraction, or of fear. The fifth century Basilica church, too, with nave and aisles, but built throughout of brick or of stone, with simple mouldings and simple decoration, could be effectively used, if a different plan were desired; and it would be cheaper, better, roomier, and more honest than the expensive pseudo-classical and Gothic churches, which, as used by us, are little more than monumental deceptions. In these or some such churches severely plain in plan and in decoration, yet beautiful in their just proportions, the multitude may be adequately instructed; but in the most costly churches of the day the preacher's voice is lost amid the intricacies of plaster, and reaches but few of the small number that ever have the needed inducement of seats.

One need not be a pessimist to believe that religious art, like other arts, is in decay. The plaster mould and the iron mould multiply forms that are bad, and make easy many kinds of deception. German gold and paint make things seem better than they are; and all the world approves the lie. Churches seem to be called beautiful in proportion as their ornamentation is glaring and inartistic, and the weakness of their construction is concealed by painted plaster. In the large cities the theatres, the hotels, the coffee-rooms, and the shops have caught the disease; and nearly everything is plaster painted and gilded, or wood stained to look like anything but itself. The ornament and the decoration of the day are glittering cheats. In other countries the Church is yet the mother of architecture; but in this country the churches are costly and offensive deceptions. For every trick or deceit there is the ready answer, "It looks just as well;" but the argument applies as logically to character and to dress as it does to churches. A new style of simple, honest church, designed for the change in circumstances and in thought, is needed; and the sooner it is adopted,

the better for art, for people, for clergymen, and for religion. Places of worship are not built for speculative purposes, and they ought not, by reason of the sacredness of their character, to imitate the commercial tricks of buildings made to be sold; but, if they be worse than the trade structures, they cannot be honorable to God or serviceable to man, and must become, though not called, temples for the glorification of sham.

RELIGION AND LIFE.

The Orthodox Theology of To-day. By Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth.
Old Faiths in a New Light. By Rev. Dr. Newman Smyth.
Philosophy in the Church of Rome. By Thomas Davidson.

THE decline of religion as a dogmatic belief forms a topic upon which much has been said and written in the last few years. It is a phenomenon which naturally attracts the attention of all observant minds, since in the question of belief are bound up the most important issues of life. Morality, so the avowed atheist does not hesitate to admit, must fade away when the basis on which the code of ethics is built is once withdrawn. Society, as such, therefore, is as much interested in the issue as are the advocates of religion on the one side and their opponents on the other. This general interest accounts to a great extent for the endless number of opinions expressed on the subject. Yet while there is an immense discrepancy between the views advanced on each side, there are, nevertheless, some points on which there appears to be very general agreement; and these points are, therefore, well worth investigating.

First of all, it is apparent to any one who follows the religious movement in its surging to and fro as it is expressed in contemporary literature that a much more correct and much more definite understanding of the true meaning of the term "religion" has obtained. Not a few argue and seemingly not without good reasons that doctrinal belief as such is falling into discredit simply because a more correct conception of the office and mission of religion gains from day to day greater currency. This, it is maintained, explains why rationalism has succeeded in making such frightful

inroads into the rank and file of Christian society; and it explains, furthermore, why the charge is preferred against all religious systems of our day of being powerless either to direct or to hold their respective followers. Nor is it possible to entirely contradict this bold assertion. For it is indeed remarkable with what wonderful perspicuity and clearness some modern writers, though unbelievers themselves, point out the inadequacy of Theism, of Protestantism, and not less so of Positivism, to serve as a religion of mankind. In a series of papers published in preceding numbers of this REVIEW some of the more striking instances have been discussed. It has been shown in them that the charges just referred to are by no means idle accusations; but are well founded, and that they apply with much force and precision to most Christian denominations. For this reason it seems to be a very natural conclusion that the religious systems of the past, together with those of the present day, will pass away and make room for one which, it is true, still remains an unsolved problem of the future, but of which the hope is entertained that some master-mind will construct it before long. This belief is spread far and wide, and is entertained seriously by large numbers. Nor is it just to blame society for holding such views. In many respects this view of the situation is quite correct. It contains an admission which of itself is full of promise, whether expressly made or only implied. The creed of the future, it is acknowledged, must be more than a mere cold abstract truth like the laws of numbers, the basis of mathematics. It is conceded, and this is the first point of agreement, that whatever the unborn religion of the unborn to-morrow will or may be, it must not only be able to take hold of reason, and through the intellectual faculties exercise a wholesome influence upon will and action, but it must do more. It must be able also to fill the human heart and to raise a certain enthusiasm. In short, it must be able to appeal effectively to all the nobler and finer springs of action in life, that is, it must be able to *fill life's full measure*. Most Christian denominations fail to do this. They do not, as has been shown very conclusively by some of the ablest pens of our times, come up to those practical tests which our pre-eminently practical age has applied to them. They are failures; they have shown their inadequacy to grapple with life's entirety. Hence, the prediction made respecting religion in general, that is, of all existing religions, certainly holds good with regard to most of them.

A marked increase in the correct knowledge of the meaning of religion has apparently produced a proportionate decrease in the extent of religious belief. Knowledge and religion appear to stand, indeed, in inverse proportion, and it is hardly a matter of surprise

that this perplexing relationship should have shaken the convictions of many honest-minded people.

Again,—and this forms the second point of agreement amidst universal disagreement,—while it is believed that the world at this day has no religion worth having, it is also believed, and probably with greater firmness and greater certainty, that no matter what the future of mankind will be, some sort of belief, some religious system, will not be wanting in it. On this point there exists in fact no divergence of opinion at all. And for very obvious reasons. The world is no longer in its infancy. It has reached the ripe age of manhood. More prosperous times may be in store for it than it has enjoyed in the past, but the world will have no other body, no other soul, no other earth, no other heaven than it has had. In other words, the elements of life, and its conditions in the future, cannot essentially differ from those of the past. To assume, therefore, that mankind will ever relinquish its hold upon that which has ever been its inseparable companion in the past, is irrational. Besides, it is only necessary to witness how hard the human race struggles at this very time to retain that companion, and to observe also how hopeless that struggle is in the majority of cases, in order to discard any such assumption as altogether improbable. People, when brought face to face with the necessity of parting with their religion, are seen to cling to it with the force of despair, however unsatisfying and plainly false that religion may be. What the attitude of individuals may be as to this does not, however, concern us here. They must be left to decide for themselves whether to reject the claims of so-called science, or to accept them and lend a willing ear to the tempting insinuations of the spirit of the age. In days when everything appears to be upset and without firm foundations, the general drift of thought acquires more importance than that of social fractions.

Now the two points to which we have called attention as the two points of agreement which are clearly observable at present, result from the preponderating tendency of our age to take practical views of all things, religion included. Practical tests are asked for in all things. These must be given or else society remains cold and unmoved. The question of religion is, therefore, no longer what religious system displays the most scientific, the most philosophical system and arrangement of dogmas; nor what religion contains the fullest promise of coming up to the requirements of the creed of the future. The question in its naked reality is this: *Has* religion ever solved the problem of life, has religion mastered life in all its complex ramifications, has it dealt successfully with it, has it ever solved the enigma of life in a practical way?

This, we take it, is the key-note which has been struck in our days,

and which is re-echoed more or less distinctly from all that has been written on the subject. Religion is tested and measured by life. Society, not entering thoroughly into the subject, and reasoning superficially, has declared that no such thing as genuine religion exists at the present day in this world. It is self-evident, however, that if there be a genuine religion, no practical test to which it can be subjected can possibly have any fatal effect upon it. A failure to stand the most crucial test, namely, the test of life, would plainly demonstrate that it was not, in point of fact, genuine. On the other hand, if it stands the test, then the sooner this becomes plainly manifest the better for society.

It seems almost superfluous to remark that in what follows the words *religion* and *Christianity* are used as interchangeable terms.

The discussion of the category of creeds to which the old Pagan beliefs, and the Asiatic and African forms of worship, belong, is virtually closed in this nineteenth century. For it is not contested that Christianity shows an immense advance over all religious systems which preceded it. The modern civilized world may learn, no doubt, a great deal from studying the forms under which the human race, under varying conditions, gave expression to its irrepressible want of some religious belief. But while this is true, it would be an insult to the standard of enlightenment which happily prevails now in civilized society, to presume for a moment that the worship of any Pagan deity could be seriously revived. Religion stands or falls with Christianity. This much is admitted. Hence it follows that if Christianity is not an idle phantom, if it is aught but a mere delusion, too long held by a superstitious crowd, then it should be able, in at least *one* of its forms, to show itself equivalent to and co-extensive with life. No answer to that query can, of course, be made before the meaning of life is ascertained; and here we refer not to the meaning of life in the general sense of the term, but of life as applied to man, who is the highest form and embodiment of natural life.

Life, when applied to man, comprises a great deal more than that which he has in common with creatures on a lower plane to which this word is also applied. Life, being no fiction, but a stern reality with which each human being has to deal, whether it chooses or not, includes, it is true, the cycle of animal life. But, as even the most advanced scientists concede that man is not all muscle, but has also non-physical or intellectual life, duplex elements present themselves at the outset. In his reason and intellect man possesses faculties whereby he may cut loose from the material world and soar above it. Experience confirms this fact in a way which excludes every possible contradiction on this point. Animal life and intellectual life do not, however, exhaust life in its entirety. Life,

in regard to man, embraces more even than the sum of his physical and intellectual activity. It comprises the whole complex array of relations springing from the action and reaction and interdependence of physical and intellectual functions and activities issuing forth and culminating in what is called the "moral" life. Cultured thought and science, and hence enlightened society, are honest enough to admit this.

From this brief and condensed analysis of life, it is plainly to be seen that religion, in dealing with life, must perform a threefold office, and fill a mission as regards physical, intellectual, and moral life. This triplex relationship encountered in the social unit recurs, as a matter of necessity, in society and in mankind at large. For the human race is formed of nations, these of families, and these in turn of individuals. Hence it is utterly impossible that the human race should not possess what every member thereof possesses. Moreover, it stands to reason, that the triplex nature in the race should manifest itself in the same order in which it appears in individual beings. To presume that the order clearly established in the life of man is not reversed in the life of mankind, is not in accordance with common sense. Nor is the order reversed as a matter of fact. But this fulness of life, that is of animal, intellectual, and moral life, is not put at once into the possession of any human being, except in a potential sense. In infancy, which is the first stage of life, the animal portion preponderates almost to the exclusion of the other elements. But, as life runs on, the intellect gradually awakens from its dormant state, and that awakening signalizes the second stage, which is, as it were, added on to the first. And when intellectual activity has once fairly set in, a moment arrives when something within begins to whisper about duty, about obligation, about responsibility, and the like; and *then*, and not until then, does a human being enter upon the social field where the law of morality regulates with stern hand the intercourse between man and man. The transition from one stage of life to the other does not appear as a sudden and abrupt change, but is a continuous as well as a progressive process. The length of the period within which that change is accomplished may, and does vary, in almost every individual. The popular expressions of the three stages of life, namely, animal, intellectual, and moral life, recur in almost every language, under the terms, "infancy," "childhood," for the one, "youth," "manhood," "ripe age," for the others.

In the life of mankind, periods corresponding to the gradual development which is observed in man, should not be wanting. Nor are they wanting. And hence, in order to test religion by life, it is not enough to establish simply that in individuals the three successive phases are successfully passed through, but it is neces-

sary to prove that the fulness of life in the human race has been successfully dealt with by religion. If this has been done, it must be a matter of historic record. It must be shown that religion has directed its main energies, with discerning eye, always to the conquest of that stage which characterizes in a prominent degree the period at which mankind and religion came into direct contact. The verdict does not depend so much upon the success or the failure which may have attended the effects of true Christianity upon some, or even upon many individuals, but rather upon the success or failure of its effects upon that vast aggregation of human individuals which constitutes the race. This is a practical test, and one fraught with fewer difficulties than any other, to settle the great question, whether the world at this day has or has not a religion worth having. A very brief summary of the historic facts bearing upon this subject is, of course, all that can be given within the limited compass of this paper. But, what is alluded to in few words can be verified or amplified from the shelves of any well-assorted library. It is not our purpose to give more than a few bold tracings as an impetus to private study and reflection. The digestion of ready-made mental dishes seldom if ever bears good fruits, and never in any abundance, whereas independent work along a distinctly marked line hardly ever fails to lead to the destined goal.

At the beginning of our era a true and perfect religion was revealed for the first time by the Founder of Christianity. Consequently true religion and humanity were then for the first time confronted by each other. The question now arises, What was the state of human society at that period? Upon what stage of life had the race as such entered? What was it that religion first attacked? Fortunately, there is no lack of authentic records as to the aspect society then presented. Competent historians have drawn pictures of it in clear-cut and well-defined lines, and in colors still fresh and unmistakable. The task of consulting history on this point is therefore very easy. History tells us that it was a period during which everything was literally engulfed in the reign of the passions. The Pagan creeds had run out their course. They had proven themselves powerless to restrain any longer the animal instincts from acquiring supreme control over the ruling nation, the Romans. An unbridled indulgence in all that catered to sensual appetites had reached a height which it is difficult for us in the far-off distance to conceive. Licentiousness, avarice, luxury, selfishness, a total ignoring of the rights of fellow-men, a willingness to sacrifice these remorselessly for the gratification of some passion; these were the traits which characterize the rulers of the period, and the period itself. Life was wastefully poured on every carnal thing. Materialism's foul blight darkened the in-

tellect, chilled all the nobler emotions, paralyzed the heart, and tainted the times so much that the equilibrium of the moral law seemed to exist no longer. Corruption and depravity hurled the mightiest of all nations towards the bottomless pit of perdition which the unchecked reign of the passions had prepared for it as an ignominious grave. The animal life threatened to extinguish the intellectual and moral life. Yet, rotten to the core as the Roman Empire was then internally, it still stood externally before the world as a colossus. North of the Alps and beyond the Rhine the Gallic and Teutonic tribes had succumbed to the superior soldiership of Rome. In Spain, and across the Straits of Gibraltar, all along the north coast of Africa, Roman eagles were planted, and in loud tones proclaimed that the nations which lived there were subservient to that great power which had known how to vanquish them on the battlefield, and thereby to turn the freeholders into slaves, so that their labor increased the wealth of their rulers and enabled them to satiate their every whim as long as time would permit. In Egypt, the land of the pyramids, Rome also reigned supreme; and the measured tread of Roman legions was re-echoed alike from the shores of the Pontus Euxinus and the placid waters of the Persian Gulf. Even in the extreme northwest, as then known, namely, in Britannia, and again in the extreme east, on the borders of the Indus, Rome was acknowledged as the mighty mistress of the world. Rome had absorbed realm after realm. The philosophy of Greece and the mysticism of the East had been brought into the Eternal City. All creeds were sought to be amalgamated, and strength expected from the forced consolidation. But Rome no longer reigned by virtue or justice. The secret of power and expansion lay only in the intelligent use of that very element of physical strength,—that is to say, brute force, whose preponderance in individuals undermined already the existence of the race and poisoned the life-blood circulating through its veins. The domination of Rome, from the time Christianity was preached in the East down to the collapse of the Empire, rested only and solely upon the skilful and intelligent use with which physical superiority was guided, controlled, directed, and marshalled for the subjugation of whatsoever offered resistance. The structure of the Empire in all its greatness could no longer prevent the masses from uttering that cry of "*Panem et circenses*," which tells its own sad tale. The masses of the people ask not for right or for justice or for equity. No, they ask simply for what will sustain animal life, and for what can delight only the degraded tastes of a degraded populace. Therefore, if there ever was a time when the supremacy of animal life was clearly depicted in the state of society, it was *then*. The first and

the lowest stage of life in mankind had reached the utmost development of which that element is capable. It was consequently a time when the mission of religion as regards the human race was most clearly mapped out. The conquest of the life of the passions in man is, as is well known, the first task of religion; the same conquest in the race proved to be the first task of religion in its relationship to mankind. Whether this strange identity deserves to be regarded as a providential arrangement we shall not discuss here. It suffices for us to know that the first stage of life in the race was conquered by religion. And this is not a question open for discussion. It is a historic fact that it *was* done, and also *how* it was done.

After the lapse of three short centuries, the great Roman Empire lay at the feet of the Church of Rome in precisely the same manner in which the animal man finds himself before man when converted into a religious being,—that is, a Christian. Evidences of the victory of religion in the social unit abound. The long catalogue of martyrs, confessors, and saints proclaims that victory with a never-dying eloquence. If, on the other hand, evidence is demanded of the subjugation, at the feet of Christianity, of the first stage of life in the human race, the Roman Empire, the apotheosis of power, and as such, the superlative expression of the aggregation of animal life in the race, history speaks in accents not less eloquent of the victory of religion over human society. The examination of the past in the comprehensive way in which the philosophy of history bids us to examine it, establishes, therefore, that historic Christianity,—*i. e.*, the Catholic Church,—has recorded in indelible ink a victory which offers internal as well as external evidence that the world has not in vain agreed to count afresh its age from the date of the birth of Christ. Mindful of the condition of society and of the powers which were allied to uphold that condition, the fulfilment by Christianity of the first stage of its mission offers in itself a testimony to the heaven-born origin of true religion.

Intellectual activity and vigor follows, as has been stated before, the manifestation of physical life in the individual, and mark, as it were, the second stage. It does so likewise in the race. As soon as nations strip off the garments of infancy, the second evidence of the possession of life in its entirety appears on the scene. It is the intellect, then, which asks for untrammelled empire. As the revolt of the passions forms the first act, so does the revolt of the intellect form the second act of the great drama,—"life."

Rome's fall swept away the old nations, and with them most of their culture and civilization and vices. What was left behind was

buried out of sight. Barbarians grew up in the place of the extinct nations; crude masters of art and science, full of vital energy, but unskilled as yet in the full and free use of all intellectual faculties. Religion stood before them like a mother who had undertaken to train them in virtue and chastity, but yet like a mother who had not as yet told them the *why* and the *wherefore* of what she had taught. That silence was now to be broken. As the waves of time rolled on, fragments of the philosophies of Greece and Rome were washed ashore. What had been saved from under the ruins of the Roman Empire gradually spread among the new nations and imparted a powerful impetus to the growth of their intellectual life. Drinking knowledge from those perennial masterpieces of human thought (unaided by a light from above), which the great minds of Greece and Rome had fashioned, philosophy, logic, metaphysics became known as taught by these, and became better known and better understood than they are in our own days. Religious faith alone no longer sufficed for mankind. The expansion of the reasoning faculties imperatively demanded that Christianity should be cast into a complete and perfect system of philosophy and theology. Thus stood religion before its second mission. Its energies had to be addressed now to the reconquest of man in his collective capacity, by showing that the intellectual life no less than the physical falls within its province. This time it was not the force of the passionate instincts and propensities of man's frame, but that greater and subtler force, the force of his reason, which had to be mastered by religion. The universal demand of human society had to be met for a rational system of belief which possesses not only faith, but places a well-ordered system of dogmas and doctrines, based upon sound philosophy, before mankind.

To do this, it was necessary that Christianity should build up a system of theology and philosophy which, by its greatness alone, would put into the shade the works of those intellectual giants who continue to be honored as the master minds of antiquity, and whose greatness has never been called in question by any Christian philosopher. And here, again, it is a matter of record that the only religious organization which, as a historic organization, reaches back to the very dawn of true religion, signalizes its second triumphant victory. What is known as the scholastic philosophy was called into life; and, under such lights as St. Thomas Aquinas, it reached a perfection which made the rebellious intellect of human society bow in reverential assent. The monuments which have been left standing as landmarks of that period well deserve our attention. For, whoever studies scholastic philosophy, and particularly the works of the Christian Aristotle, will gladly testify that

they stand unrivalled as severe, continuous, logical processes of thought. They superseded the world's thought before Christianity was born, and nothing written since then equals that which preceded Christian philosophy. As Mr. Thomas Davidson so well remarks in his *Philosophy of the Church of Rome*, "Few, indeed, are the scientific or philosophical works of modern times which the application of St. Thomas's commentary on the *Organon* would not prove to be illogical or self-contradictory. Logic especially has been little more than an ignominious testimony to the absence of metaphysical ability."

The second stage of the mission of Religion, like the first, is thus seen to have been successfully achieved by the Catholic Church in the individual as well as in the race. Two stages of life have thus been grappled with and brought under dominion by true Religion, yet life, in its entirety, still remains unconquered, for the third and last stage is not yet included in the conquest. The adequacy of true Religion to cope with life's fullness remains now to be established.

The complex nature of life in its entirety, which has been mentioned before, makes it necessary to clear up somewhat this mystery before proceeding further. Life, it was said, when applied to man, means the expression as well as the measure of all the faculties of man and their relationship. Life, in its entirety, embraces all animal appetites, all intellectual pleasures, and is, in point of fact, the combination of the two natures, resulting in the constant struggle between liberty and the passions, which forms the battle-field of the moral order. The inferior being in the scale of those whose patrimony constitutes life, namely, the brute creation, is led by instinct. In the animal, instinct and passion are the same thing. But man, though endowed with instinct and passion, inasmuch as he is endowed with a body, and thereby subjected to the yoke of sensible things, rises by the light of reason towards the intelligible orb, where omnipotence itself is ruled by the law of justice. Man alone possesses the prerogative of knowing the true, of willing the good, of loving the beautiful: three things not included in the narrow limit of human life, and yet within its reach. In man there is, as the ancestor of liberty, a luminous principle, which the world knows as "conscience," and which forms the fulcrum of moral life. Man, moreover, is not born alone with his body and his intellect. He is the necessary fellow-citizen of the world, and carried along by it in a whirlwind, which governs him. No man can trace a line of circumvallation around himself, no more than he can escape from the ideas of his times, the customs of his country, and the traditions and friends of his youth. It is only by raising himself above and beyond his place here below that he can behold

a horizon free from bondage, because free from limit. Human nature, in the fulness of life, shows, therefore, a susceptibility of enlargement and transformation, which forcibly indicates that other elements are added on to the physical and intellectual part of his nature. These do not cease to play their respective parts, but the moral element also enters upon the arena and resolves itself into two, namely, a social and a supernatural element. Moral life, therefore, is the result of the action of several forces, and the mainsprings of action are three, namely: reason, liberty, and conscience. Reason may be said to stand at the summit, and serves as a light; liberty, the free choice between good and evil, right and wrong, appears as the great force in the web of activity; conscience, lastly, stands between the two as a sentiment, urging ever on to make the proper choice. These forces move between two points. At the one end stands the innate and invincible desire for happiness; at the other, the extent of our understanding. The distance between these two points varies. For only the indwelling desire for happiness is a constant quantity, while the reach of the intellectual faculties is a variable quantity. Still, no matter how limited the latter may be, this much is certain, that truth is always the object which is desired, because through it alone happiness is attainable. Truth has this, in common with happiness, that it flies ever before us into the illimitable regions which intelligence opens up. By an invincible energy man is borne on beyond time and space towards the infinite. For no limited object ever satisfies our faculties. It is a fallacious delusion to think it can; for the moment we possess what we were longing for, our thoughts and desires, after a short moment's lingering, raise themselves at once to other objects beyond our grasp, until at last we reach out into the infinite. For this reason man cannot find in himself either the principle, or the object, or the term of his existence. He drifts by necessity always into the infinite, which, it is true, he fails, and always will fail, to comprehend, but which he may, and does, apprehend, and of which he is furthermore bound to assert that it is no abstraction without reality, since he himself seeks in it the highest truth, the greatest happiness, that is to say, the fulness of life. Nor is this all. Truth forms, indeed, as life teaches us, the legitimate object after which our intellect craves in order to attain to happiness. But truth alone would leave us cold, unless it is surrounded by a halo, by a something which is capable of touching our innermost feelings. In order to raise a certain enthusiasm, truth needs to be equipped with an attractive force, and this latter is beauty. The union of truth and beauty furnishes alone an object which can be seized by human nature with all the intensity of which it is capable, and the expression of this highest and greatest and noblest

energy of life is called "love." In love life presents to us its greatest friend, that is to say, the most potent cause of virtue and happiness, and at the same time its greatest enemy, that is to say, the most potent cause of vice. A passion at its root, love, in its crystallized form, is the masterpiece of life, its summit and at the same time its essence. Yet, as is well known, even the most liberal cultivation of thought by science and letters affords no guarantee, no shelter, from falling a prey to that passion in its lowest form. No less an authority than Herbert Spencer admits this freely.

Having arrived at this point, it is evident that the main office of Religion, as regards the moral life, consists necessarily in converting the greatest enemy into man's strongest ally. The belief in God, which is the first and foremost truth of Religion, is one without which life itself becomes unthinkable. Nor is this belief an artificial creation of Christianity. It is, on the contrary, a native and universal belief, emerging spontaneously in connection with the feeling of dependence and moral obligation, which appears as soon as our intellectual faculties arrive at maturity. The physical order already furnishes mankind with a negative intuition of God. The intellectual faculties, through the ideas of truth and justice, serve as a direct intuition, while life, that is, human society, gives us a practical intuition of His existence. Life itself confirms what Religion affirms. Life itself shows the necessity of religious teachings of such character as true Christianity proclaims. If we trace effects back to their causes, we show these to be effects themselves until we arrive at the dilemma either that cause itself is a phantom and no reality, or else that there is one self-existing intelligent supreme cause. Or, if we consider the human body in its relation to mind, namely, the very striking and obvious adaptation of the bodily organs to the service of our intelligence, every one who is conscious of being able to begin action cannot help experiencing a most vivid perception of design. And this consciousness of design makes the theory of chance, as the alternative of design, fall to the ground. Chance or fatality as such has no existence. Every human being forms his own destiny, since what is called destiny is simply the consequence of our own decisions. There is as little incoherence of actions, and inconsequence of results in the moral order, as there is in the physical. Even liberty has its law, and produces a regular web. A causal nexus pervades the whole universe, and consequently life. The wondrous order and harmony and perfect arrangement between part and part, visible everywhere in nature, speak to human intelligence, and human intelligence responds to nature. Both meet in conscience, and life places the seal of experience upon the revelation of the three. Whoever tries to escape from this revelation, which the study of life forces

upon our recognition, must silence a voice whose sound reverberates from age to age. Unbelief is, therefore, never a sequence of the study of life, but simply a form of indifference, and exists only as such. For the more knowledge expands the more clearly and fully is the supreme wisdom of the Creator attested; so that it is perfectly absurd to suppose that life tells of no God, rather than of God. It is only because we are so much entangled in material surroundings that we go on in a kind of reckless dream, and forget that we are captives of sense and slaves of time.

The office of religion in reference to life's entirety, as is apparent from the preceding analysis, is one which implies not only a dealing with man as a union of body and intellect, but implies a dealing with man as a being whose highest aspirations rest in the infinite; claiming God as Life-giver and possessing in conscience a force which might perhaps be defined as "reason inspired by divine love." Religion must illumine our reason, expand its horizon, call into play all our faculties, establish harmony. It must influence liberty so that due preference shall be given to the counsel whispered by the voice of conscience. In order to make reason, liberty, and conscience a triune and harmonious force, truth must be placed by religion before our understanding in such way that its beauty may engender within us a love to possess it in full. In other words, the consciousness that we cannot, as long as we are prisoners of time and space, comprehend the infinite, must not be allowed to cast us down and render us faint-hearted and despondent, but must be joined to the consciousness that the fountain-head of truth alone possesses the beauty, in the love of which man finds not only the object of his desire for happiness, but real undefiled happiness itself. In fine, religion, by using passion to destroy passion, must elevate the most fatal force from its lowest plane, and place it upon a summit where divinity and humanity meet in a true embrace.

This is the plain mission of religion, and, from its consideration, it is at once patent that all those Christian denominations which do not acknowledge a supernatural element are *ipso facto* excluded from putting forward any claim to being "the true religion." There is in reality but one Church, the Catholic Church, which can even pretend to be, and which in fact is the repository of true religion. Some Protestant denominations declare, it is true, that the supernatural element enters as a potent factor into life. But while acknowledging this much, they display a profound ignorance of the frailty of human nature. Protestantism stands, beyond contradiction, as the religion of respectability before the world. Its churches, as a rule, are well carpeted, provided with comfortable pews, good chairs, and are filled at the services with congregations who, in point of wealth, dress, outward appearance, etc., are in advance

of Catholic average congregations. But a monotonous discourse on some topic of the day, or a free interpretation of some Bible-text joined to some hymn-chanting and organ playing, forms pretty nearly all that is given as religion to living beings. And that this is not capable of combating with life's energy requires but slight insight into human nature to perceive. No religion can possibly be efficacious without a series of channels by means of which life may be guided whenever its current threatens to drift away from the straight course. A memory which is only too willing to forget whatever imposes restraints, must needs be constantly reminded of the existence of safety-valves, so to speak, and of the necessity of using these unhesitatingly, All this can be accomplished only by raising an enthusiasm of fervor and affection, and by maintaining the same. Else no such effect can be produced, nor can it be expected to be produced, as religion must produce it in order to fulfil its real functions. The Catholic religion, as is now pretty generally admitted by all except prejudiced Protestants, shows daily how thoroughly able it is to subjugate life's vicissitudes; to engender patience, and submission, and virtue; to console and strengthen the weak and despondent; to curb the pride of conceit and to engraft the lesson of true charity practically upon her adherents. So far as the individual is concerned, Catholicity beyond dispute comes up to the requirements made by life upon true religion.

Outside of the pale of that Church religion has gradually become a matter of culture, of fashion, tinged only here and there with religious sentimentality. And modern culture, as will presently be seen, is incompetent to solve the momentous enigma of life. Modern culture does not neglect physical culture. That portion of human nature receives careful and considerate treatment. Walking, running, rowing, riding, in short gymnastics in general, are encouraged if not enjoined by it. And we are far from finding fault with these bodily exercises, which are perfectly legitimate and even praiseworthy. But our age has no mental gymnastics. The intellectual training shows a deplorable one-sidedness. The non-physical part of human nature, whether it be called mind, intellect, reason, or what not, consists, always and at all times, of will, memory, and understanding, as its three component parts. To cultivate one and neglect two, or to cultivate two and neglect one, means, we take it, onesided culture. And this is precisely the fault of the culture of our age. Modern thought is made up almost exclusively of facts and fancy. Science furnishes kindly the facts, literature cooks these facts, and puts them in fancy dress. The scientist searches heaven and earth with a diligence, and perseverance, and boldness sometimes truly appalling. He brings down the stars with the telescope, breaks them to pieces with the spectroscope, takes these pieces up

and examines them with the microscope, and then all is handed over to the man of fancy, who makes a sort of celestial dish out of the promiscuous material. It reminds one forcibly of Shakespeare's lines,

> The searcher's eye in a fine frenzy rolling
> Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,
> And as imagination bodies forth
> The form of things unknown, the poet's pen
> Turns them to shapes and gives to airy nothing
> A local habitation and a name!

Now facts and fancy engage at best our memory and imagination; the heart is starved from want of that which can be gotten at only through the will. The most important element of mental training, without which society never can rise from the desire of enjoyment through indulgence to the idea of happiness through self-restraint, is, therefore, left out altogether. The only effective agency which the study of life unfolds as available for that purpose, that is to say, love, has no place therein. Yet love—not love of the earth, however, and all its sordid objects, but love of that Life which is ever Lord of Death—has the power to guide man towards his destiny. Culture, therefore, can never hope to take the place of religion. For no religion can hope to survive which holds not the secret of Divine love and through it the key of real life.

From the variety of the elements of life, and from their characteristic nature, it follows that religion, likewise, has variable as well as constant elements. The groundwork remains the same as long as life remains what it is. The superstructure is, of necessity, subjected to the same changes to which life itself is subject. New times bring about new phases of life, and every phase of life, whether old or new, forms a province of religion. Hence it is, that the progress of thought, the progress of civilization, the progress of life, calls constantly for new applications of the constant to the variable elements of religion. The battle-ground of Christian apologetics will ever be shifting its place with the accumulation of experience, the progress of science, and of human thought in general. Religion has always to deal with living issues, and consequently must take the world as it is, not as it was a hundred years ago. And for this reason a continuous progress in the comprehension, and in the methods of presenting the truths of religion, will ever form a concomitant of the unchangeable doctrines of Christianity. The history of Christianity is, in reality, only the history of progress, and it seems strange, therefore, that there should be persons who feel alarmed on hearing that Christianity is being recast in our days. Yet what else is it that Pope Leo XIII. urges with such earnestness, and wisdom, and eloquence upon the

expounders of Christianity? He bids them simply prepare for the conquest of life in the human race, the third and last mission of religion, and the one which, as yet, is but partially carried out. He does so, not, however, as if he held that Christianity and life were out of joint. The supreme Pontiff who stands at the head of the Catholic Church is one who, to use the words of Mr. Thomas Davidson, is not only a man of great energy and administrative ability, but who combines to a wonderful degree the qualities necessary for the guidance of the Church in the present times. Pope Leo XIII. is said to be "enthusiastic, without being blind; scholarly, without being clogged with learning; devoted to the Church and her hereditary rights, without desiring that they should supersede all those of the state; a sincere admirer of the scientific, moral, and political progress of modern times, without admitting that it can ever enable us to dispense with revelation and religion; an enlightened believer in the powers of reason, without enthroning philosophy as the arbiter of truth; and, above all, a sincere Christian, without being a fanatic, an ascetic, or a saint." This well-paid tribute, coming from one who does not identify Catholicity with religion, contains the avowal that no one sees clearer the situation than the head of the Church of Rome. It is unquestionable that to life should be imparted again that fragrance and flavor which modern culture has taken away from it, and which genuine religion alone is able to restore to it. But Mr. Davidson, in the essay referred to before, commenting upon the revival of Thomism, imagines that its purpose and object is to restore that condition of thought which made the Church of the thirteenth century a possibility, in order to restore thereby the Church to the position of authority which she enjoyed at that period. He is, accordingly, unable to see that Thomism ever will accomplish what he surmises Thomism is expected to accomplish, and he predicts, therefore, that the whole movement will prove a failure. Here Mr. Davidson is right. Were the object of the Encyclical "*Æterni Patris*" to bring back through the study of Thomism the condition of thoughts and things which existed in the thirteenth century, it would necessarily fail of its object. For the world has no intention to retrace its steps. It is neither desirable that this should be done, nor can it be done. Mr. Davidson is, therefore, quite right in asserting that such a hope of the Church of Rome will never be realized. But he is quite wrong in assuming that the Church entertains such a hope. He looks upon the revival of Thomism as destined to do what no Catholic, and least of all Pope Leo XIII., expects from it.

Careful philosophical training is an indispensable requisite for practically applying the changeless doctrines of religion to the ever-changing constellations of life, for determining their multitudinous

bearings, for proving cogently the errors of science, for elevating science by demonstrating that scientific progress does not endanger religion, but on the contrary helps to advance the true objects of life, and its entire dependence upon the Master of all life. In the two great struggles of the past between religion and life, the road to the objective point was comparatively a straight and level road. In the present struggle, it leads over hill and dale, through mountain passes, and over precipices, now running alongside of the bank of a murmuring brook, among romantic scenery, and again in tortuous windings creeping up a steep glacier. At present, art, letters, science, history, ethics, music, painting, sociology, in short every branch of knowledge, and every department thereof, have to be made subservient to the great end. For all lead to the goal, because all, from one point or another, touch life, form life, are life. Those who enter the arena should, therefore, be properly equipped. Unless a very solid mental training furnishes a firm, solid foundation, even the heaviest mental calibre will be compelled to retire, for a time at least, from the stage of activity. Not even the great Napoleon could lead an army equipped with flintlock muskets of the time of Gustav Adolf to victory against one fitted out with the most improved repeating rifle. The same holds good in intellectual warfare. The Church, therefore, appropriates the large mass of light thrown upon life through the progress of civilization, in order to be able to show that the light *she* offers has a power of incandescence which the light of mundane knowledge can never hope to equal. Thomism, after all, is the A B C of true philosophy, without which no problem of philosophical nature can be understood in all its bearings, and much less can be dealt with. It is, therefore, the means of reducing the existing intellectual chaos to order, and the first step which augurs the victory of the Church in carrying out the third and last stage of its mission to mankind. The reorganization of society, the welfare and prosperity of all nations, the security of our culture and civilization, nay, the very continuance of the secular order, depends upon this last victory of true religion over life, this last expression of human greatness and human nothingness. The characteristic mark of the Catholic Church, of true Christianity, of true religion, is life. She has outlived the past, she will outlive the present struggle also. This struggle appears to our generation so great and significant, simply because we reckon with time on the niggardly basis of human life, forgetful that "time" applied to Christianity means, always and forever, more strength, more vitality, more vigor, in fine, more life, since what we call "life" is but existence with beginning and end, whereas religion gives life without end.

THE PUBLIC PRESS AND PUBLIC MORALS.

THE men of this world who modestly assume to themselves the title and character of children of light, are forever telling us that the Catholic Church is the mother of ignorance. She is slow, heavy, mediæval. It is even one of her own proverbs, that "Rome moves with leaden feet." She is hopelessly behind the age, and strives to keep her people back with her. She steadfastly refuses to advance and march hand in hand with the times. She will persist in clinging to the skirts of Thomas Aquinas, instead of falling at the feet of Herbert Spencer, and worshipping with him at the altar of the unknowable. She still regards St. Augustine as a greater theologian and teacher than Mr. Beecher or Mr. Talmage, or any of the pet preachers of the day. Everything that the children of this world bless we are assured she curses. She curses freedom of thought, as the liberty to believe or disbelieve at pleasure, and regardless of light and evidence, is called. She curses divorce, that most beautiful of modern institutions. She curses heresy. She curses science, that modern science that strives to reduce all that is to matter. She curses free governments, like that of France to-day. She curses free education. She would set her *Index* upon every public library; for, above all things, she curses and hates, and would, if she could, abolish the free press that spends so much time, and thought, and money in exposing her machinations, bringing her dark deeds to light, and showing to the people of the world her true character and stamp.

This, as seen at a glance, is a heavy indictment against the Catholic Church. Yet it is held as a dogma by every nine out of ten non-Catholics, who brush by us in the streets, or hold converse or business relations with us every day. It is, secretly or openly, the average opinion entertained of the Church by the great mass of people without her pale, by the lettered as by the unlettered, by the foolish as by the wise. Nothing, save the grace of God, can shake this belief, which, through three centuries of malice, persecution, and false teaching, has become an inheritance, and, as such, is accepted without question or hesitation. As towards the Roman Catholic Church, non-Catholics are absolutely color-blind. Everything in it flares with the lurid colors of the Scarlet Woman. Thus, whatever position Catholic opinion may take in law, in politics, in government, in religion, in social and public affairs, all other opinion instinctively ranges, or is inclined to range, itself on the opposite side. Voltaire's maxim was older than Voltaire. "Lie," said that great master of the art to his disciples, "lie boldly; lie

always." That has been the policy of all heretics, schismatics, and opponents of the Christian unity from Luther down to the first Christian century. Nay, it goes back a step farther, to him who, Christ has told us, was a liar from the beginning. So, to-day, we Catholics must be content to bear the burden, and face the consequences of three centuries of inherited calumny and falsehood regarding ourselves, our faith, and our Church.

This being, and no one will deny that it is, the attitude of non-Catholics towards us and our cherished and honest beliefs, suppose, for a moment, that the last of the load of charges brought against the Catholic Church were true, would there be anything so very extraordinary or unreasonable in it? Suppose the Catholic Church did actually and formally condemn the non-Catholic and anti-Catholic press, which, in its turn, constantly condemns and everlastingly anathematizes the Catholic Church, what, after all, would this be but a conflict of rival jurisdictions? Must our avowed enemies expect us to bless them when they curse us, and allow to them the monopoly of light, and reason, and truth? They anathematize to their hearts' content, but as soon as the Church raises her voice in solemn expostulation and warning, a howl of hate and execration fills the world.

Thus it was when the Syllabus was promulgated; thus it was when the scheme of the Vatican Council was propounded. The world resounded with the rage and clamor of those who hastened to place themselves in the ranks of the condemned, and then blamed the Church for condemning them. Thus it was, again, when the Prussian persecution of Catholics broke out. Where did Prince Bismarck find so powerful and universal an agent to applaud his policy and approve his course as in the free secular press of all lands? In Germany he was compelled to create out of the milliards that he wrung from France a "reptile press" to propagate a gospel of lies against the Catholic Church, its head, and the Catholics of the German Empire, and, at the same time, to approve of every new act of the Chancellor and his satellites in the policy of persecution. In other lands the secular press and religious Protestant press, with their characteristic love of freedom and fair-play, of their own accord acted the part of reptile press for Prince Bismarck. All through the persecution the London *Times* had, and still has, as its chief Berlin correspondent, a prominent employé of the Prussian Foreign Office, whose letters Englishmen accepted as the free and unbiassed opinions of an Englishman. Some of those letters, with very slight variations, appeared in certain American journals as the unprejudiced opinions of "our Berlin correspondent." But, with or without such conspiracies as this, the public press, as a whole (with an honored

exception here and there), ranged itself freely and ardently on the side of the persecuting government.

It may plead now, with sorrow and shame at the havoc it has seen wrought by the material success of the Prussian policy of persecution, that it has changed in this regard; that it no longer upholds so wicked and unprovoked an attack on the German Catholics and the Catholic Church; that it has since condemned, and will continue to condemn, Prince Bismarck for having ever entered on so mistaken and suicidal a policy, which it always predicted would turn out a mistake, and so forth. It is safe to be a prophet after the event. Prince Bismarck has since found reason to condemn himself for his course of action towards the Catholic Church and the German Catholics, not so much because he feels any great compunction of conscience for what he has done, as because he found the Catholics too strong for him. His failure probably explains the cause of the free foreign reptile press having dropped from him; though, if the truth were known, their secret sympathies are with him still. The Catholics have not budged an inch from their position, and, if they were worthy of the condemnation and obloquy heaped on them from every quarter of the globe, they are more worthy of it to-day than ever.

Or, take the instance of the recent doings in France, since first Gambetta inaugurated his anti-Catholic, which he called anti-clerical, policy, which is simply an imitation, in a possibly more vicious and diabolical form, since it occurs in a land that, at least, calls itself Catholic. What stand has the public press taken on this matter? One would have thought it might have learned a lesson from the course of the Prussian persecution, and its failure; a lesson of charity, and humanity, and wisdom; some sense, at least, of the direction in which right and freedom really lay. In some instances, and not a few important ones, this was so. Some of the powerful secular press took the lesson to heart, and have steadily set their faces against the new anti-Catholic persecution in France. But it is beyond question that the great mass of feeling in the public press is in the other direction, on the side of sympathy with Gambetta, and in approval of the expulsion of the Jesuits, of the friars and nuns, and Christian Brothers; of the withdrawal of the schools from Catholic influence; of the tearing down of the crucifixes from the walls of the public schools. The movement is anti-Catholic; being anti-Catholic, it is in the direction of light and right, and the emancipation of human reason; therefore it is to be supported, seems to be the argument which these gentlemen use. Gambetta and his henchmen, Paul Bert, Ferry, Clemenceau, etc., all apostles of the new *culte*, are right, Monsignor Freppel and his comrades are wrong. So, up with the Communists, down and out with the

Jesuits and the rest of the "black band," is the popular cry in America as in France, in the air of a free republic as in the air impregnated with the poison of Rousseau and Voltaire, touched with the brimstone of revolution.

From instances like these—they might be multiplied indefinitely—it may be stated, beyond fear of contradiction, that the public press all the world over is, by its very constitution and nature, opposed to the Catholic Church, and that its columns are always open to attacks on the Catholic Church. Nor need one go outside our own free soil to prove this. There is ample evidence of it almost every day; every day, in fact, in some shape or form. And that is one of the points insisted on here. The public press is anti-Catholic, and, it is to be feared, we must count on its continuing to be so.

Let us not be misunderstood. We do not mean in saying this that the gentlemen who write on the public press would consciously state a falsehood concerning even the Catholic Church, however much they might be personally opposed to her and her teachings. As a rule, these leaders of modern thought who preach a gospel daily to the world through the columns of the morning and evening journals follow the growing fashion of the day, and are indifferentists in matters of religion. But indifferentists though they may have become in their mature years, they cannot wholly shake off the influence of their early training and surroundings. They were brought up and educated in a distinctly anti-Catholic atmosphere. Whenever they came across the name Catholic it was as coming across the name of an enemy,—a foe of the Republic,—a would-be overthrower of our institutions. In the books that they read the name Catholic was always identified with darkness, bigotry, ignorance, servility, and persecution. This is what we mean by the Protestants having inherited a legacy of calumny and hate against Catholics that is three centuries old. English literature, from the version of the Bible known as that of King James to the Book of Common Prayer, and all the way down the whole range to the school history or reading-book published yesterday, is steeped in anti-Catholicity,—is part and parcel of the gospel of conspiracy against Catholic truth and Catholic history. Generation has followed generation feeding on this poisoned food, until at length the poison seems to have inoculated the whole mass. The infant receives it from his mother; the father teaches it to his son. There is no escape from it; and when, in the relations of life, Protestants come in contact with Catholics, they come with this secret and invisible yet most powerful of barriers between them, bidding those stand off whom they would otherwise receive with open arms. And to think that non-Catholic editors any more than non-

Catholic ministers can escape this influence is to expect too much of poor humanity. They may have succeeded, as they generally do, in throwing off the shackles of such early teachings as they themselves received in the way of Christianity. They may look out with a smile of quiet scorn from their self-erected watch-tower of intellectual and philosophic calm over the wrangling and the jangling of "the sects," as they call them. But on that solid steadfast body, one in faith and in worship, one in the acceptance of the Pope as the supreme head of the Church on earth, as the duly appointed Vicar of Christ, and as the infallible guide of all men in matters relating to Christian doctrine and morals, the secular writer always looks with suspicious if not with hostile eye. He dreads that power that he was taught to dread and to hate from the beginning. He is always prepared to believe ill of the Catholic Church, and so to lend his influence to any plausible appeal against her.

This is seen in the sudden anti-Catholic eruptions that take place from time to time in the public mind. It is the easiest thing in the world to raise an anti-Catholic cry, especially at election times. The "Jew-baiting" of which we have heard so much of late in Germany and Russia, and at which a shocked world holds up its hands in holy horror, wondering how such things can be, bad as it is, is as nothing compared to the Catholic-baiting which any one who has lived through a generation must, within his own experience, have encountered in some shape or form.

Mr. Gladstone stands in the eyes of a very large portion of the world as one of the most liberal and enlightened of statesmen, and a devout Protestant Christian. For half a century he has been dealing more or less authoritatively and intimately with the affairs of millions of Roman Catholics. He must count many Catholics among his personal friends. One of his dearest friends was Cardinal Manning. Catholics have been his colleagues in Parliament, have served in his government, have borne great public trusts with dignity and honor, have helped materially to win England's battles by land and sea. Yet it is not so long since this experienced liberal statesman strove with all the vehemence of his nature to set the world aflame on the Catholic question; to address elaborate insults to the holy and venerable Pius the Ninth; and to impress upon his countrymen what he alleged to be a fatal fact,—that it was impossible for a man to be at once a sincere Catholic and a loyal subject of the British state, as though England had itself never been Catholic. Everyone remembers how the battle raged at the time and the rain of pamphlets that set in. But it will be remembered also how strong a following Mr. Gladstone found in the United States, as in England, to accept as gospel every word

he uttered. The same thing would occur to-morrow were there any plausible excuse for it. Witness how all England went wild because the late Dr. Wiseman assumed and was confirmed by the Pope in the title of Archbishop of Westminster, since he could not take his true title, which had been stolen from the Church, of Archbishop of Canterbury.

On this, then, Catholics must always reckon, a latent universal hostility to the Catholic Church such as exists not against any other body, not even against the dark sects that menace all society, and whose agents are so active in their secret propaganda. This latent hostility naturally finds a happy home in the public press, which is, after all, but the expression of public opinion in its various moods. It is sometimes, often for long intervals, quiescent, but a very little friction will kindle it into heat. At all events the material is always there to convert into sins of malice what might often pass as sins of ignorance against us; and this for the reason already given, that Protestants have been carefully instructed either not to know us at all or to know us wrongly.

So much for the purely anti-Catholic side of the public press, which necessarily renders it not only obnoxious, but dangerous to Catholic readers. Let us now look at the public press in itself, apart from any immediate question of creed. To begin with, it has no creed. Let us put aside at the same time all questions of "organs," of newspapers pledged to support this or that policy, this or that party, this or that man. Let us look at them in bulk, as purveyors of news, as critics of public events, as guides and leaders of public opinion, for they are all this; and the guides and leaders of public opinion must *ex officio* take the grave matter of public morals into their hands. They must say daily, this is right, that is wrong; this is false, that is true; this should, that should not, be; it is right to suppress this, and to publish that.

Here we are at once in the midst of a very wide subject, a subject wide as the world and the universal family of man. Are newspapers, is the public press to be judged in its action and conduct by that highest code of human morals which is found in the laws and the precepts of Christ? Is the editor of what is called a great daily newspaper bound in conscience by the Ten Commandments, and by the commandments of the Church to which he belongs or professes to belong? Is he bound to conduct his paper on those principles? Those commandments bid him obey the Lord his God, keep holy the Sabbath, to swear not, to do no wrong to his neighbor or his neighbor's wife, to speak the truth, to love his neighbor as himself, to give no scandal, to steal not, to touch no ill-gotten goods, to slay not, either in person or in character, to bear no false witness, etc. Judged by these everlasting canons of

Christian morals, how does the public press stand in this and all lands?

It is manifestly idle to put the test, for not even the most moderate and well-behaved of public journals, leaving out of count the journals of infamy, could stand it. How the editors and managers of public journals can reconcile this deficiency with their professed following of and obedience to Christian dictates, must be left to their own conscience. They strive to evade the straight and severe test, and argue this wise:

A newspaper is not an exponent of the ten commandments, or the precepts of the Church. That is the office of the priests and of the Church itself, an office that we do not presume to usurp. We act simply as a sort of chorus to the great drama of human life and action. We chant the record of events from day to day. We are the letter-books of the public, the daily journal of human deeds and events. We are neither the keepers nor the guardians of the public conscience. We are simply blotters, wherein the hurried events of the day are hurriedly set down, sometimes with note and comment as a warning, a guide, or an encouragement to the public. We tell of evil as well as of good; of things known to all or that should be known to all. Our chief office is to gather and assort the news of the world and set it daily before our readers. They are not compelled to read us; they do it of their own will; if they find ill in us it is of their own seeking. We, in common with them, denounce the ill and maintain the good. On the whole we "make for righteousness," and the evil that we set forth in our columns is placed there as a lesson and a warning.

That is probably the manner in which a conscientious editor or manager of a newspaper would defend the office, functions, and conduct of what would be called the average public journal, and it is a very plausible reasoning, though it stands outside of the straight test of Christian morals. But, judged even by this standard, which is not at all a safe or a high one, how will the so-called respectable press come out? Leaving out the question of news, the chronicling of actual events, is there any daily secular newspaper in the land, one might ask, in the whole world, that is wholly and strictly respectable? The advertisements alone of any one successful secular daily newspaper would of themselves condemn it; and the more successful the paper the more numerous the obnoxious and immoral advertisements, which too often extend to professedly religious journals that go into the world with the pretence of preaching the gospel and the religion of Christ. For obvious reasons it is unadvisable here to cite evidence of the truth of this general charge; but it is a fact known of all men. In many

a journal that will give a page or more of the Sunday's sermons by ministers of all creeds, will be found columns set apart for professional infamy, on the proceeds of which the respectable paper counts for a large portion of its revenue. Would the *Index* of the Catholic Church be too severe a restraint on human liberty in instances such as these of daily and abundant occurrence?

That is one detestable and abominable feature, common, more or less, to all of the great public journals, and in this sense alone they are encouragers and propagators of vice. Some papers, it is true, try to prune their advertising columns to some degree, but none are wholly free from this taint. Then comes the great matter of news. What kind of news is most acceptable to a daily journal? Naturally, and as a matter of course, that which is conceived to be most interesting to the readers of the paper, that will create a sensation, and make the paper sell. Bishop Berkeley regretted that the devil should have all the good tunes. In a much wider and deeper sense is it to be regretted that the devil or his agents should furnish all the news considered good by the editors of newspapers. A great scandal in private or public life is always sure game, and most welcome. A great divorce case, for instance, will be detailed in all its minutiæ, and flashed over the country, over the ocean even, from day to day; for the time being, all other news must yield space to that; not even the loathsomeness of detail is spared, and the viler the evidence introduced, the more carefully is it set forth. Nor is this all. People who read the matter in the newspapers crowd to hear the evidence, and fight for places; those supposed to represent "the best" in society, take their lunches along to sustain them during the ordeal, and opera-glass in hand to catch every phase of expression on the countenances of the parties to the suit, sit with more devotion and patience through the *cause célèbre* than they generally display in church. The case of a prominent public man in Brooklyn, some years ago, inundated the whole country with a flood of filth, and the flood ran at high tide for months. Had that no ill effects on public morals? One leading newspaper, after having given much of the case, at last declared, in disgust and shame, that it would print no more of it, but a day or so after it recalled its resolution, and went on publishing as vigorously as its respectable brethren. And this is only an instance of instances that are constantly occurring. So that it is safe to say that, the more notoriously bad the case may be, and the more notorious or prominent the persons connected with it, the greater prominence is it given in the public press, the more scrupulously are all its details hunted up and set forth, each newspaper fearful lest its neighbor should get a "beat" on so important a public matter. The argument in such a case is this: well, this thing has

occurred, and the public have heard of it; it is a pity, of course, that such things should be, but there they are; public curiosity is excited; the facts must come forth in the court; is it not better to furnish them in full, as a lesson and a warning to the public? As well ask, is it not better, by way of giving a diagnosis of a loathsome and foul disease, to call the people together, and in their presence subject sound persons to the disease as an *experimentum in corpore vili*, or show forth the nature of a mortal sin by making an innocent soul commit it. It is worse than the old Spartan lesson. To give their youths a horror of the vice of drunkenness, they would assemble them and bring in the miserable helots before them, stupefy them with liquor until they lost reason and control over themselves, and sank to a condition lower than that of the brute.

Take, again, the case, of which instances occur so often, of a notorious murderer, who is at last brought within the meshes of the law. The press is immediately at his service, and his sayings and doings, his habits, his early life and history, his appearance, his very diet and prison "drawing-rooms" are set forth with painfully accurate detail. His dying speech from the scaffold is given, the names of the "distinguished" persons present or who visited him in his cell, and even the wretch's last struggles as he dangles from the rope, are not forgotten. The respectable public press converts him into a hero, and gives more space to him than it would to many a noble person, the story of whose life would be a lesson of interest and of good to the people.

It would be waste of time to run through the list of general charges that might be fairly made and sustained against even that large and powerful public press that claims the name of respectable, and whose profession is to serve the public for its highest good. The fact stands patent to all eyes that, as a rule, what is evil and tends to evil finds a larger share of attention in the press than what is good or tends to good. Not that the latter is neglected, by any means; but it is allotted a second or third place. It is like a sprinkling of holy water over a very mixed congregation. The editors and managers may be very estimable and worthy gentlemen in private life; but when sufficient motives urge them, there is positively no law that, in the conduct of their newspapers, they feel bound to respect, save the written law against absolute obscenity and actual libel. Private character, the sacredness of a man's home, the recognized feelings of human respect, weigh not a feather in the scale when balanced against the interests of a newspaper. The newspaper motto seems to be, "all is fair in war and politics." If the editor has the Ten Commandments hanging in his sanctum,

he, if he is a conscientious man, carefully turns their face to the wall.

All this, be it remembered, is said of newspapers claiming to be respectable and worthy servants of the public. Let any decent man ask his own conscience if, in the average daily newspaper, no matter where edited, he does not find something or other, often a vast amount of matter, that he would, if he could, expunge, and that he shrinks from admitting into his family. There can only be one answer to such a question. Yet these people profess to write for the public, and give the public just what the public demand.

Doubtless, they are right, much as indecent showmen are right, but, if right, what a depraved state of public morals does their claim denote! For there is another class of public journals that appeals to a wider constituency still, that is wholly vicious and immoral, and that, by going beyond the journals that strive to cover indecency with some remnant of respectability, reap a golden harvest by feeding the multitude on the husks of swine. If the public prints that are issued in this country alone, daily, weekly, semi-weekly, monthly, the class of publications most widely circulated and generally read, were collected in one place, and tabulated according to their moral grade, the exhibition would shock and grieve all who are not wholly depraved. It would be found that the favorite reading of our public-school instructed masses is the wholly bad and immoral, and that the gradation is from the vile depths upwards to the few who rejoice in the light of heaven, in goodness, and in purity. And this is true of every kind and class of literature to-day. The records of the public libraries attest that the favorite reading consists of the trashiest novels, and that the vilest of vile novels carry off the palm in point of numbers. The very children, who go to Sunday-school once a week to learn religion and morals (save the mark!), may be found going to day-school, with their dime novels or blood and thunder weeklies packed in their pockets or their satchels. And yet we are a moral people, and rejoice in a respectable press!

An exhibition of our popular literature would, we say, shock and sadden the heart of any decent person, and, in our own case, of any well-wisher of the republic. Paganism, gross Paganism, might be written at the head, the foot, and at each side of it; not the Paganism of the great writers, poets, historians, and philosophers of Greece and Rome, but the sensual slough of the masses when the Greek states and the Roman republic and empire declined; when vice was erected into a worship, and temples were built, and priests and priestesses consecrated to its horrible rites; when the masses roared for their *panem et circenses*, and when emperors,

like Nero, buffooned and played the beast over and before them. There is not a large city in the world to-day that has not its paper or papers absolutely devoted to vice. Here, in our own moral and public and Sunday-school country, with its fifty or sixty millions of people, let any one pause a moment at any public news stand, and notice the people who surround it—people of all classes. On what do their eyes gloat? On the obscene and the vile; on prints whose very publication ought, in a well-guarded commonwealth, to be an indictable offence against public decency and public morals. We grow virtuous over the immorality of the French, and our enterprising publishers are ever eager to catch up the latest and vilest of their novels, translate it, and shed it broadcast over the land. Well, it pays. Vice always seems to pay—for a time.

Look at it as we may, it is impossible to regard the public press, the press that most circulates, as a whole in a sense favorable to public morals, and this quite apart from any special profession of faith. Much public good is undoubtedly wrought by the independent press, as against corruption or tyranny in government, gross malfeasance in public office, gross and well-preserved shams, and dangers that might threaten the public liberties. Yet, on the other hand, how much that is corrupt in government, in officials, in public institutions, in public persons, is and has been for a long time sustained and supported even by the press calling itself independent, until the corruption finally falls to pieces of its own rottenness. The plain truth is that the press is published to pay at any price; honestly, if it can, dishonestly, if it must; and, as dishonesty generally gives quicker returns and larger profits, especially in a wealthy country, like our own, which offers innumerable opportunities to adventurers in every class of life, honesty must be content to go by the wall. The newspapers profess to be mainly "the abstract and brief chronicle of the time," to "hold the mirror up to nature." If that be so, all that can be said is, our nature wears a villainously vile visage. If this be the free press that the Catholic Church is accused of condemning, it may conscientiously plead guilty to the accusation.

Well, what would you have? will be the natural question. According to your judgment, the public press is either wholly, or three-quarters, or half demoralizing. At the very best it is by no means what it should be, or at least what you would expect of respectable journalism, no matter whether or not it professed to be regulated by the Ten Commandments and the true Christian code. You admit it is possible of good, and, in fact, effects some good. But the evil in it predominates. In a case of this kind two courses lie open: one, to reform the press, by creating a better public tone and purer public taste; the other, by gagging the press, setting a

censorship over it, and prosecuting it for whatever the censorship judges to be damaging to faith or morals; setting up an *Index*, in fact, to which the press, like all other publications, should be subjected. This, in the moral sense, would be equivalent to reducing the press to the condition, in a political sense, that obtains in Russia or Prussia at the present day, or that obtained in France, under the First and Third Napoleons. In a word, it is to destroy the freedom of the press, as the word freedom is understood to-day. That word covers the largest license, short, as already indicated, of the statutes against absolute obscenity and libel. Short of these absolute lines, any newspaper or publication may sail as close to the wind as it pleases, and still lie within the harbor and protection of the law.

In countries professing freedom the idea of press censorship may as well be abandoned. Nor, on the whole, in the strangely mixed condition of public affairs, is it desirable that such censorship should exist. Were all men of one way of feeling and of faith, there would then exist a recognized common moral code, to which all would subscribe, and any grave violation of which would be immediately felt and resented by the public body. This public moral sense would, of itself, constitute a censorship more effective than any written law. But, unfortunately, we are not so constituted in the world to-day, and we must take the world as we find it. The unity of the Christian faith, that alone could preserve a consensus of public moral opinion, has been broken to multitudes and nations, and a spirit of bitter antagonism has sprung up among millions of professing Christians. Multitudes of those who broke away from the unity of faith have drifted into the atheistic camp, whose motto is, *Ecrasez l'Infame:* crush out the infamy, called Christ, and rebel everywhere and always against this Christian Code that presumes to dictate to freemen the conduct of their every thought, word, and deed. Among non-Catholics it is unhappily true that the latter drift of thought is prevailing. All who are not Catholics are against the Rock, the centre of Christian unity, and the head of the Christian Church on earth. But a large section of Protestants still cling to many of the Christian teachings and principles that those who led the first Protestant revolt took out of the Church with them. These, however, have become more and more scattered and obscured and wasted, as generation followed generation, wandering farther away from the truth, until at last, Rome being practically out of sight, they found themselves in a doctrinal morass, with snares and pitfalls on every side of them, and only the dry cold light of what called itself pure reason shining ahead on barren ground and an endless waste of desert. That reason set itself over against Christianity, saying, " Your Christ is

an impostor. He was no God as He claimed to be. He was simply a man like Confucius, Mohammed, Brahma, Moses. Revelation is an invention. There is no God but man; no truth save what he discovers by his own reason; no code given to him to follow; no revelation from a heaven invented by priests." Protestantism staggers under and towards this reasoning to-day; and it is to be found, if not openly, at least between the lines of every secular newspaper and in not a few of those professedly religious.

Censorship of the press, then, in countries professing freedom, must be abandoned as hopeless, and for the reason that men's minds differ so diametrically about many things. But there is freedom and freedom. In France to day, for instance, the press is free to write all sorts of abominations against Christian morals and the Christian religion, but if a Catholic newspaper dare be emphatic and speak out its mind on the manner in which Catholics are treated by the government, it is immediately prosecuted, and the editor fined, sent to prison, or sent out of the country, as in the case of Baron Harden-Hickey, the editor of the sprightly *Triboulet.* So with the press in Germany, while the anti-Catholic persecution was raging. The Protestant, the Jewish, the Socialist press were all at liberty to heap every kind of insult on Catholics, to belie Catholic history, to defame the Church, to invent Papal Bulls even, as in the case of the *Cologne Gazette;* but, let a Catholic paper dare give vent to its honest opinion about Prince Bismarck and the proceedings of the government, it was straightway choked off for treason against the state. So we see from these examples how differently people of different ways of thinking interpret the phrase, "liberty of the press," and that *Indexes* are, by no means, restricted to the Catholic Church, where, when used, they are at least used only in defence of morals and Christian truth.

It may be taken as beyond question or argument that the public press will exist in this world, and will exist free. It has grown to be a public necessity. It has become the daily intellectual atmosphere that, whether we like it or not, we are all compelled in some way to breathe. Sometimes, in this changing atmosphere, "fair is foul, and foul is fair." A century ago, half a century ago one may say, the newspaper, in its present form and scope and universal comprehensiveness, neither existed nor was dreamed of. It was the bottle on the seashore that a careless fisherman found and uncorked to see what was in it. And a vapor came forth and mounted to the sky, and darkened the sun, and took shape, and strode the earth a giant, a geni, full of power for good or for evil, at once man's master and man's slave. Many a monarch, many a statesman, has since tried to force back the spirit into its bottle, but have succeeded only for a time. A leakage, sooner or later, was

sure to occur, and the geni came forth more powerful than ever, and only exasperated against those who would seal him up, and hinder his free movements.

"Let me only make the people's songs," was said of old, "and I will undertake to govern the people." "Few know," said Oxenstiern, "how easily men are governed." Doubtless, among a fairly intelligent and high-spirited people the less government, in the statutory sense of the word, exists, the more easily are they governed, inasmuch as they take themselves and their own affairs in hand, without having a policeman forever at their elbow. The songs that in old days were the expression of the popular voice have now yielded to the press. It is pre-eminently that: the echo, rather than the guide, of public opinion.

Being this, one would naturally expect it to be the truest representative of the commonwealth as it exists; of public tastes, public thoughts, public wants, desires, tone, and tendency. And here comes in the great difficulty of dealing with a question so wide in its bearings as this. If the press be all this, if newspapers supply the people with just what the people demand, and if there can be no such thing as a press censorship, if the public press be really and actually the true expression of public opinion, what need to argue more? The press is just what the people, and not what the editors and managers, make it. If they support this paper or that, it is because they like the politics, or the moral or immoral tone of this or that paper; because, as a whole, it satisfies them.

Now here lies a fallacy. Few or no respectable men, so far as the experience of the writer goes, approve wholly of any daily newspaper that they purchase and read. And the list of these is by no means restricted to Catholic readers. Many buy two or more newspapers every day, their business requiring them to do so. One or two they throw aside after having found what they wanted in them; the least objectionable they take home to their families, wishing, on the whole, that they could, by some happy chance, have a safe, sound, moral newspaper that would furnish the news of the day, comment on public events, occupy itself with the current matters of human interest, without giving prominence to moral filth, public scandal, and human viciousness. But it is just these objectionable points that make the newspapers "spicy." Without some columns of such matters daily, there is supposed to be "nothing in the papers." An editor will gleefully publish in his newspaper what he would be ashamed to read or hear read within his family circle. Consequently the newspapers appeal chiefly to the depraved tastes in man, and write down to the lowest level instead of writing up to purity and right. Let any man be at pains to count the columns of decency and indecency published in

the average daily newspaper within a year, and on which side will the balance lie?

It is impossible, in face of such facts and reflections, to believe that the public press, as a whole, or even greatly in part, is conducive to public morals. If we thought so for a moment, we should be inclined to think that public morals, save of the wrong kind, no longer existed. And as censorship in countries calling themselves free cannot be, the public must only look to themselves to right matters as far as possible, by selecting the least objectionable papers. But here, again, comes in to the great mass of people the demand of business, and the advertising question. The more objectionable papers usually have the largest circulation, and are consequently more desirable as advertising channels. The good papers go among good people, and the good are in a sad minority.

It will be found, also, that the newspapers which appeal more directly and constantly to the lower appetites of men, are those deeply impenetrated by the anti-Christian spirit. Not that they will profess openly disbelief in Christ; not that they will not devote columns of their space to the Sunday sermons, to charitable and worthy purposes, often to the consecration of a Methodist temple or a Catholic Church; not that they are unwilling to expose an anti-Catholic lie or calumny, when it is fairly brought before them. They will do all this and much of it, and do much of it year in and year out; but, on the other hand, the associations into which such matters are brought in the same newspaper, are of themselves often a public scandal, and perhaps it were better that they did not appear at all in such evil company. And then the manner in which things that ought to be sacred are too often handled; the jeer, the jibe, the scoff, the jocose, free and easy, police-court style in which they are treated. The very head-lines, meant to be sensational, are in themselves often lines of blasphemy that strike a Christian soul with horror and shame. Did a Christian, a strong public moral sense prevail among our people, such things could not be, for the very next day thousands of protests would reach the office advising the manager that the people would not endure such infamy, and refusing to purchase the paper any longer. If this were only done we should speedily see a wonderful reform in the moral tone of our public press.

Reverting, again, to the more strictly Catholic side of the question, there is not, to the writer's knowledge, a Catholic daily newspaper, certainly none of any note, published in the English language. And yet we claim upwards of six millions of Catholics in this country, three millions in England, five in Ireland, leaving out Australia, British India, and the English-speaking Catholics scattered

over the globe. France has several distinctly Catholic daily newspapers, the best known of which are the *Univers* and the *Monde*, but none of them have anything approaching a circulation corresponding, not with the Catholic population of France, but of any one of the great French cities. What is true of France is true of Italy, and of other European countries called Catholic. In all, the Catholics lag wofully in their support of a Catholic press. In Germany alone, where the Catholic associations are better organized, and where distinguished Catholic laymen take a leading part in politics and public affairs, have the Catholics, under the fierce fire of persecution, rallied to the requirements of the hour, and answered the reptile and the anti-Catholic press by a press of their own, strong, able, and magnificently supported. Nor here, in the United States, are the German Catholics behind their countrymen at home in this respect. In many places they have their daily, bi-weekly, and weekly newspapers, all flourishing and doing a good business. They put to shame us English-speaking Catholics, who complain often that we have neither money, time, nor patience to support a Catholic press, yet find money, time, and patience enough to purchase and read at least one daily newspaper, often more than one. There is not a Catholic periodical or journal in the country that costs half the subscription of a daily three-cent newspaper.

It is not the purpose here to enter into an argument to advocate the starting of a daily newspaper that should be Catholic in principle, pay special attention to Catholic interests, Catholic news, Catholic progress all over the world; that, without necessarily having the word Popery heading every column, should be edited by intelligent and competent Catholic journalists—their number is not so few as people imagine—whose work, founded on Catholic principles, should, in political, commercial, financial, and social affairs, equal the best work of the leading non-Catholic journalists. If Catholics only half knew how to utilize their forces; if they possessed only a little more Catholic and public spirit; if our wealthier Catholics only get together and agree to start such an enterprise, and if the less wealthy would only join in, a strong and able daily journal, with Catholic knowledge and Catholic principles as its guide, would not be a dream of the far future, or a scheme that one only turns away from with a sinking of the heart. As matters stand to-day, it is with the public press as with the public schools. Both one and the other absorb some of the best and most ardent of Catholic workers, men and women, competent in every sense, as teachers and guides, but who, for lack of profitable employment in Catholic interests, are compelled to devote their

energies to other purposes, in a certain sense to the service of the enemy.

Some years back there was a proposal to start a Catholic daily newspaper in England, and the idea was taken up with some enthusiasm. A very distinguished English prelate was questioned as to his views of the matter. He shook his head dubiously, and rather frowned the scheme down. His views express those of many on the same subject. He was afraid, first of all, that the calibre of Catholic journalists would hardly stand the weight of the conflict they would be called upon to sustain. In the hurry and flurry of publishing a daily newspaper he feared that mistakes on grave Catholic matters would constantly be made, and the Catholic paper be thus made the instrument of committing the Church to a false position, which her enemies would be quick to seize and take advantage of. He doubted, too, if Catholics would support the enterprise. And, finally, he saw no necessity for it, since the Protestant press had altered its tone, to some degree, of late. It was inclined to be fairer with regard to Catholic matters, and its columns were open to any intelligent person who chose to expose misrepresentation or misconception of Catholic matters.

This opinion is worthy of much weight, as coming from one of our leading prelates in England, a man of great piety, knowledge, zeal, ability, and experience in public affairs. As for the alteration of tone in the secular press regarding Catholic matters, a general improvement has been noticed, both here and in England, for many years past; yet no man was more vehement in his exposure of the falsehoods and misrepresentations that filled the English press at the time of the Vatican Council than the prelate we have quoted. On the other hand, a Catholic naturally resents going a-begging to a non-Catholic paper, whether for information concerning Catholic matters, or for refutation of calumnies against Catholics, while he has, or ought to have, the means at hand to give information to others. It is hardly fitting that we should call upon strangers or enemies to tell all about us and our affairs, and then complain if they tell lies, or make blunders. And this view of the matter would seem to be that of our Holy Father Leo XIII., when urging the prelates and Catholics of Italy to do all they could to support the Catholic press, to sustain the journals that were in existence, and to start others where they did not exist. He desired that they should be made the equals, in ability and interest, of the non-Catholic and anti-Catholic newspapers, which depended largely, as do those in this country, on Catholic subscribers for their success. He deplored the fact that the journals which were opposed to the Church, and dangerous to public morals, should everywhere succeed, while Catholic journals seemed correspondingly to fail, and was very

earnest in his recommendations to the Italian prelates and clergy to do all in their power to remedy this defect.

The same urgency presses on us in this country. In our support of the Catholic press, even as it exists among us to-day, and of Catholic publications, we are far behind, not the secularists alone, but large Protestant communities, like the Methodists, for instance. Though no single Protestant body in the country equals ours in point of numbers, several of them surpass us in the number and circulation of their magazines and newspapers. It is only within the present year that the Catholic publishers of the country have united in deploring the remarkable falling off in the Catholic book trade here. When was such a complaint heard from Protestant publishers? And this in face of the facts of greater numbers of Catholics, more wealth in the general body, and a better, more popular, and *cheaper* class of books. The inference is obvious: the Catholics who buy books at all, buy largely, if not chiefly, of Protestant houses, and thus take into their homes the very literature whose essentially anti-Catholic, if not distinctly immoral character, it has been the aim of the present article to expose. An experienced Catholic publisher has assured the writer, and given him instance upon instance, of the melancholy truth, that the rising Catholic generation is not like the generation passing away. It has neither the same Catholic spirit, nor the same Catholic heart, of the brave race of men and women who founded and planted the Church in this country, and watched with pious eyes over its wonderful growth and development. The new generation finding, as they imagine, the work accomplished, seem to think there is nothing left for them to do, except to go over to the enemy, and be like unto him. "As father (or mother) is dead, you will please stop the paper or magazine sent to him, as there is no further need of it," is a request that frequently comes to a Catholic publisher, and presumably from a graduate of one of our Catholic colleges, or convents. Something is wrong. Where is the evil, and where the remedy?

It is surely a sad sign to find our people so backward in supporting what is really one of the great adjuncts, as well as one of the great necessities of Catholic life—a Catholic press. Never was there more need of it than in this day, when all society seems upheaving, when all faith is challenged, when men everywhere ask o Christ, "Art thou the Son of God?" and who, when the Church answers for Him, proclaim that the Church blasphemes. It is a time of great doubt, and of great public danger. Even the very laws recognize and foster great public immoralities, such, for instance, as the almost indiscriminate practice of divorce, and that great incentive to divorce, civil marriage. The spirit of modern legislation in all lands is against the Christian faith and Christian

ethics. To this spirit we owe the purely secular public school, to which is traceable much of the indifferentism and atheism that we see growing up and grown up around us. All these features of our society, from which a tender Christian conscience instinctively shrinks, and which many statesmen and publicists of no special form of faith watch with dismay and dread, are accepted by the public at large as the glories of the new civilization, the advance and progress of the age, the flower and the fruit of the freedom which the Catholic Church is assailed for warning men against and condemning. The public press is full of it from day to day. It is the upholder and exponent of it. How is a better tone to be created among the people, while all that is is generally accepted as pretty much all that ought to be? And Catholics, instead of standing out against it, lend their aid to the very literature from which so much of it springs. A Catholic daily newspaper! There are already about forty Catholic journals in the country, and not a dozen of these enjoy a circulation equal to any of the more popular Protestant papers. It is time for Catholics, one and all, to put this question to their conscience: Am I to go on always supporting a class of literature that, if not openly licentious, is essentially demoralizing, and in spirit and in character anti-Catholic and anti-Christian? For such to-day, and for the reasons given, is the public press of all lands.

THE OBSERVANCE OF SUNDAY AND CIVIL LAWS FOR ITS ENFORCEMENT.

THE enactment of a new penal code in New York, which passed through the Legislature of that State almost unexamined, startled the community, when it came to be put in force, by the severity of its provisions in regard to work, trade, amusements, and travel on Sunday.

Instead of being a mere re-enactment of old statutes, it contained new and strict provisions, enhancing the guilt of the offence, and meting out penalties and punishments beyond precedent in the annals of New York legislation.

In the city of New York when the police at first attempted to enforce the law ragpickers and cigarvenders, expressmen and confectioners, men on a hundred different charges were arrested. The newspapers were filled with protests, judges were beset with applications for injunctions, and the whole system of Sunday legislation came under discussion in all circles. The members of the Legislature sought to escape the falling avalanche of unpopularity by pleading ignorance of the contents of the code which they had heedlessly passed,—passed without examination or discussion, although the lives and liberties of the citizens were directly the object of its provisions.

The whole subject of laws regulating Sunday, so far as civil government is concerned, will come up in the present legislature, and the subject will not only be much discussed in Albany, but in many other States, also, obsolete or obsolescent laws will be examined, and either revived in a modified form or abolished.

Strange as it may seem, the State, in passing laws for the due sanctification of Sunday, is unwittingly acknowledging the authority of the Catholic Church, and carrying out more or less faithfully its prescriptions.

The Sunday, as a day of the week set apart for the obligatory public worship of Almighty God, to be sanctified by a suspension of all servile labor, trade, and worldly avocations and by exercises of devotion, is purely a creation of the Catholic Church.

It is not the Jewish Sabbath; it is, in fact, entirely distinct from it, and not governed by the enactments of the Mosaic law. It is part and parcel of the system of the Catholic Church, as absolutely as Christian marriage is or any other of her sacraments, her festivals and fasts, her days of joy and mourning, her indulgences and her jubilees.

In the very earliest period of the Church, when Gentiles were

received into her bosom by baptism, some of the Jewish converts insisted "that they must be circumcised and be commanded to observe the law of Moses." Certainly no part of the law of Moses was more distinctive or more imperative than that relating to the Sabbath. From the days of Nehemias it had been strictly enforced; the Pharisees were so strict in its observance, so severe in their construction of its obligation that in their eyes our Lord Himself and his apostles were sabbath-breakers and open violators of the law. Yet the apostles in the Council of Jerusalem say expressly: "For it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things, that you abstain from things sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from things strangled, and from fornication, from which things keeping yourselves you shall do well." The question before the Council was expressly what precepts or observances of the Mosaic law were to be followed by the Christians of Gentile origin, the class to which the present Christians of Europe and America almost exclusively belong. The fact that the Council enumerates some things, and makes their well-being depend on obedience to these, evidently excludes all others. Circumcision, the sacrifices of the old law, and the Sabbath regulations all stand on the same ground. They were decided not to be obligatory on the Gentile Christians. Nor is there the slightest trace in the Acts of the Apostles or the Epistles that these Christians did observe the Jewish Sabbath, even as a work of supererogation.

A book of popular instruction of much repute in England, while England was still Catholic, De Burgo's *Pupilla Oculi* (Paris, 1510), fol. clxii., 2, puts it distinctly: "One thing is to be known, that the obligation of keeping the Sabbath of the law, according to the form of the Old Testament, expired with the other ceremonies, and thereto succeeded in the New Law the mode of celebrating the divine worship on Sundays and other festivals instituted by the authority of the Church."

The only day of the week which under the Apostles seems to have received special attention was not the last day of the week, the Saturday or Sabbath, but the first. St. Luke mentions a miracle wrought by St. Paul at Troas "on the first day of the week, when we were assembled to break bread" (Acts xx., 7); and St. Paul, addressing the Corinthians, directs collections to be made for the saints on the first day of the week (1 Cor. xvi., 2). But the celebration of the Eucharistic rite and collection of money for pious uses have not the slightest connection with the Jewish Sabbath. That St. John the Evangelist received the revelation at Patmos when he was in the spirit on the Lord's day, shows simply that the first day of the week had already received that name, not that any obligation of the Jewish Sabbath was attached to it. This is made

positively clear by an epistle of St. Ignatius addressed by that disciple of St. Peter to the Christians of Magnesia. Writing against the observance of the Mosaic law, he bids them be "not men observing the Sabbath, but men living according to the Lord's day." The epistle which is ascribed to St. Barnabas gives the reason for the selection of the day: "Therefore we spend the eighth day in joy, on which Jesus rose from the dead."

In the primitive days of fervor and piety all days were so consecrated by exercises of devotion that no special command for the sanctification of the first day is traced. It was not until the primitive earnestness of Christians began to relax that we find anything to distinguish the day. Thus, Tertullian, speaking of the attitude observed at prayer, remarks: "Only on the Lord's day of the resurrection we must not only refrain from kneeling, but from all habit of care and duties, even laying aside business, lest we give place to the devil."

This became gradually obligatory, although the command was not at first peremptory. The Council of Laodicea, in 364, defines: "That Christians must not Judaize and refrain from manual labor on Saturday, but work on that day; and that, preferring the Lord's day, they must then rest, if this can be done, as becomes Christians."

The Church thus began by calling her children to sanctify the first day of the week, that on which God the Son rose from the dead, that on which God the Father began the creation of the world, and God the Holy Ghost descended on the Apostles. She commanded a laying aside of business, a refraining from servile work, as a means to the end she had in view, the sanctification of the day. Her policy was settled and acknowledged when the days of her persecution passed and a disciple of Christ sat on the throne of the Cæsars.

Constantine lent the power of the state to enforce the regulations of the Church, and the civil law began to enforce the spiritual decrees. He commanded the Lord's day to be observed by all as a festival and day of rest. The law courts were then closed, and public business suspended, allowance being made for works of necessity and mercy. But the tilling of the soil was deemed necessary and was not forbidden until a later period.

As new states arose from the ruins of the Roman Empire, we find local councils, in time of relaxation, renewing, with greater or less strictness, as circumstances required, the prohibition of labor, and of all that interfered with the great object,—the sanctification of the day as one set apart especially for the great public act of divine worship. The ancient laws of all European states contain statutes enforcing these decrees of the Church.

As long as the Catholic Church was supreme in Europe, her de-

crees were certain, her authority recognized, and the civil power, acknowledging its obedience to the spiritual, held it a duty to enforce what she commanded for the sanctification of a day set apart for the fulfilment of the first commandment,—the solemn public worship of Almighty God.

To the Jew his Sabbath was merely a day of rest. It had no special sacrifice in the temple, no offering of incense beyond that of every other day. The sacrifices in the temple, general or individual, went on without any reference to the Sabbath, nor were the Israelites commanded especially to attend any service in the temple on that day. It was a day of rest, not a day of special worship of God.

The Christian Lord's day was pre-eminently a day of worship. The Eucharistic sacrifice was offered, indeed, daily, making a perpetual oblation, but it was offered with greater solemnity on the first day of the week, and all Christians who had attained the age of reason were commanded to join in the offering, in order to render to Almighty God the highest worship, that of his own divine Son. The prohibition of work, of trade, of noisy enjoyments, all had in view the sanctification of the day, in order to surround the great act of worship with the calm and dignity becoming to it.

The laws of Christian Europe, from Constantine to the sixteenth century, were in the same spirit. They aimed to invest the solemn sacrifice of the Mass with becoming peace, and quiet, and honor. They were enacted to enforce the law of the Church, they were enacted in homage to the Mass.

Neither civil nor religious legislation gave it any feature of moroseness and gloom. Nor was any such element characteristic of the Jewish Sabbath. On the contrary, it was and is to the children of Israel a day of cheerfulness and happiness. On its eve they wish one another a good Sabbath. They meet in their synagogues to read the law and pray, although there is in the law of Moses no direct command to that effect; but, though they adhere to the refraining from labor on that day, they are not forbidden to relax their minds by genial conversation and innocent enjoyments.

The Christian Sunday was a day of joy; it was to honor the great joy of the Resurrection. The very word, Eucharist, characteristic of the great sacrifice, implies joy; that service is, in itself, one in which the grief for sin, the cry for mercy, glides insensibly into a pæan of joy. If the Church forbade her children to labor, it was not to fill their hearts with gloom and bitterness, but to draw them away from the world and its cares, and its degrading influence, and to give them a foretaste of heaven by joy.

As the life of the Church has been one of struggle with worldly influences, the true spirit of the sanctification of the Lord's day would, from time to time, in one place or another, be lost; new regulations came, new laws were passed, as the state was called upon to remedy abuses and prevent profanations.

When Europe was swept by the great religious rebellion of the sixteenth century, the public worship of Almighty God was, in many countries, as completely abolished as it was in Jerusalem by the armies of Babylon, or, subsequently and completely, by those of the Romans under Titus. The Mass, to honor which the Catholic Church had especially set apart the first day of the week, and hedged it with her decrees, was abolished. There was no other essential act of divine worship to replace it, and there could be none. There could only be a synagogue service like that of the Jews, waiting for the restoration of the altar and the sacrifice. This required no special sanctification of the day; the Jewish sabbath-law had long been extinct, and with the Mass went really and logically in Protestant countries all motive or ground for the legislation which Christian states had enacted to maintain the decrees of the Church.

Only human motives, and purely human motives, could be adduced for maintaining the old system of honoring Sunday. As the framers of the new religious creeds appealed to the Scripture as the sole authority, they found their position indefensible. Nothing in the New Testament forbids work, travel, trade, amusement, on the first day of the week. There is nothing which implies such a prohibition. The day, as one specially set apart, had no authority but that of the Catholic Church; the laws requiring its observance were passed to enforce decrees of councils of the Catholic Church. But to have abolished Sunday utterly would have shocked all men, and, logically or not, it was maintained.

The difficulty of the position was soon apparent to many in the Reformed Churches. Attendance at the services of the new religions was enforced by fine, but as these services had in themselves nothing commanded by Holy Scripture, or binding under pain of sin, a gradual relaxation ensued, till James I., in 1618, specially allowed lawful recreations on the Lord's day, and bear-baiting and cudgel-fighting came to be deemed lawful.

It became necessary to find some authority for requiring men to observe the Sunday. Several writers endeavored to show by specious and adroit reasoning that the patriarchs observed the first day of the week as the Sabbath, and that with the abolition of the Jewish Saturday Sabbath, the former revived and was binding on Christians. The answer to which was that, if the Bible was the only rule of faith, so important a precept as the observance of

Sunday, if laid down at all, must be clearly and definitely expressed in the New Testament.

When the Puritan body arose in England they were eminently disciples of the Old Testament. Nothing in the Bible had any charm for them but the terrors and severity of the Old Law. It filled their whole life and thought. There they sought the names for themselves and their children. They were the modern Israel, the rest of the world the heathen to be exterminated. A fierce and gloomy spirit pervaded them. All joyousness was a sin. To them the Sunday was but the Sabbath of the Jews, to be kept with all the rigor of the law of Moses. The very term Sabbath was applied to Sunday.

As they gained power and influence in England the legislation changed. Charles I., in the very first year of his reign, passed a law to prevent noisy sports on Sunday, and an attempt to revive his father's ideas met with stern and violent denunciation. When, with psalm and anathema in scripture phrase, the Puritans overthrew the government and sent the king to the block, they made the Sunday a Sabbath of more than Jewish rigor; and even after the fall of the Commonwealth and the restoration of the monarchy, Charles II., to gratify them, consented, in 1678, to an act forfeiting all goods exposed to sale on Sunday; all travel by boat or barge; and all trading by butchers and higglers.

The Separatists and Puritans who founded the colonies in Massachusetts were of the strictest adherents of the Sabbath theory. Those who went to Holland grieved to see their fellow-Calvinists in the United Provinces regard the day so differently. In America they attempted to revive the theocracy of the Children of Israel. They deemed themselves the chosen people as firmly as though the Bible so laid it down. Englishmen, and still claiming to be British subjects, they ignored English law, abolished the Church established by law, and made its profession punishable. The festivals of the Christian year were abolished, and their observance, even in the way of social merriment, was prohibited. The Sunday was as purely an ecclesiastical creation as the feasts, but they retained it as the Sabbath. Setting at defiance alike the Parliament and Church of England, they had full scope to carry out their own peculiar ideas, and generations were moulded in the ideas they adopted. As the colonists spread over New England, this Puritan idea of the Sabbath took root from Maine to Connecticut. Its fanatical character has survived belief in the Trinity, the inspiration of Scripture, the fall of man, and the atonement of Christ; and the energy inherited from their ancestors impels the New England man of to-day to seek to force his views on his fellow-men now

with the same determined zeal that characterized his forefathers, much as he may differ from them on most points.

"In opposition to the judgment of Luther and Calvin, as much as to the rubrics of Rome and England," says Palfrey, the historian of New England, "Sunday was nearly identified with the Sabbath of the Law of Moses, and every kind of recreation on that day was forbidden, as well as every kind of labor." The day was required to be passed in the meeting-house, and in solitary devotion and reading at home.

In their whole course they were actuated by a blind hatred of Catholicity, not that they had personally suffered from it, but taking it as persistently misrepresented by that Church of England which they hated as deeply, and which, with greatly varied severity, laid its heavy hand alike on Puritan and on Catholic. But it seems a special design of Providence that men hating the Church should thus be made the instruments of doing the work of the Church in this country by carrying out so strenuously her early decrees for the sanctification of the Lord's day she had set apart for the great act of her worship, by enforcing the suspension of labor, trade, and noisy amusement on that day, although they refused to kneel at her altars, or, indeed, bow the knee at all to Almighty God.

Their spirit was one of wrath and severity. The lesson in the Old Testament given to the angry prophet was unheeded by them, and they never seem to have read far enough in the Bible to reach the spirit of Christ, or the sweet yoke of the Gospel.

"Go forth and stand upon the mount before the Lord; and behold the Lord passeth, and a great and strong wind before the Lord, overthrowing the mountains and breaking the rocks in pieces; but the Lord was not in the wind, and after the wind an earthquake; but the Lord was not in the earthquake. And after the earthquake a fire; but the Lord was not in the fire, and after the fire a whistling of a gentle air. And when Elias heard it, he covered his face with his mantle."

They were not, indeed, the first to enact a Sunday law on the shores of the Atlantic. In the *Articles, Lawes and Orders, Divine, Politique, and Martiall, for the Colony of Virginea*, a draconic code, issued in 1610–1611, attendance at church service was made compulsory every day, as well as at sermon and catechism on Sabbath, under penalty of death for the third offence; but there was no prohibition of labor, the only clause being: "Likewise no man or woman shall dare to violate or break the Sabbath by any gaming, publique or private, abroad or at home, but duly sanctifie and observe the same, both himself and his familie, by preparing themselves at home with private prayer, that they may be the better fitted for the publique."

This law, like many others of the kind, soon became virtually a dead letter. But, in New England, the keeping of the so-called Sabbath was deemed too vital a point to be neglected. The laws there, if not as stringent as that of Virginia just cited, were enforced, public opinion sustaining the magistrates in the execution of enactments of which the following, from the Laws of New Haven Colony, may be taken as a type:

"*Prophanation of the Lord's Day.*

"Whosoever shall prophane the Lord's Day or any part of it, either by sinful servile work, or by unlawful sport, recreation, or otherwise, whether wilfully or in a careless neglect, shal be duly punished by fine, imprisonment or corporally, according to the nature and measure of the sinn and offence. But if the court, upon examination, by clear and satisfying evidence, find that the sinn was proudly, presumptuously, and with a high hand, committed against the known command and authority of the blessed God, such a person, therein despising and reproaching the Lord, shal be put to death, that all others may feare and shun such provoking rebellious courses: Numb. 15, from 30 to 36 verse."

These laws were gradually extended so as to forbid not only servile labor, but all work, traffic, and travel; and to this day travelling, except to and from meeting, is an offence against the laws of Connecticut. Nor are all these statutes obsolete, for, only a few years ago a clergyman from New York, while driving from the steamboat on a Sunday, was arrested.

As New Englanders emigrated, they carried with them their Sabbatarian ideas, and to them, in no slight degree, is due the passing of similar laws in other parts of the country, or their enforcement where they were already on the statute-book. The kindred denomination, the Presbyterians, took up the cause, and while a large class in Massachusetts, adopting Unitarianism, have become less rigid, the Presbyterians remain the sturdy and inflexible maintainers of the strictest prohibition of all labor, whether servile or not, of all traffic, and of everything in the form of public or private amusement.

The Methodist body, too, adheres strictly to it; and in the seaside towns which they have created, all riding, driving, bathing, and amusements on Sunday are prohibited, and boating is confined to the wherries which carry people to and from the religious meetings. The druggists are allowed to put up prescriptions signed by physicians, but not to sell even medicines otherwise.

Of late years, in this country, associations to carry out various theories, chiefly humanitarian, have not only been formed in many parts of the country, but, by their activity and persistence, have succeeded in obtaining special legislation, so that we are rapidly

drifting to a system of government by associations. The president of a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals or Children can in person, and through his agents, exercise powers that never, in our past history, were committed to the chief magistrate of a state or the highest judicial functionary. The rights of personal liberty, rights of property, rights of parents to control their children, are virtually abolished, or placed at the mercy of a set of enthusiasts. The public schools are run by a set of similar hobbyists, and parents have not the slightest power, either individually or collectively, to obtain for their children the least modification in the most absurd system that may be adopted.

The influenee of all these dangerous combinations is seen in a remarkable degree in a penal code recently adopted in New York. It was generally supposed to be simply a codification of existing statutes, not a collection of new provisions. It was examined when too late, when it had actually become the law of the State. Then the Bar Association of New York adopted a series of resolutions which declare "that, with hardly an exception, a change had been made, either in the definition or the penalty of every crime; that these changes have greatly and indefinitely extended the power of the criminal courts, whereby every man's liberty is jeoparded; that many new acts have been declared to be crimes; . . . that many antiquated and forgotten statutes have been revived with increased penalties, breach of the Sunday laws, for example, being punishable by heavier penalties than the revised statutes prescribe."

The overzealous associations, possessed each with one idea, had severally pressed their special points, and the result was that the people of a great state found themselves entrapped in a system of law passed in utter ignorance of its purport.

The Sunday laws are in their origin a part of the Catholic system enforced by the state when Europe was Catholic. The day and the regulations have no logical basis except the authority of the Catholic Church. The very language still shows this to be their origin. This new code provides:

"The first day of the week being by general consent set apart for rest and religious uses, the law prohibits the doing on that day of certain acts hereinafter specified, which are serious interruptions of the repose and religious liberty of the community.

"A violation of the foregoing prohibition is Sabbath-breaking.

"Under the term, 'day,' as employed in the phrase, 'first day of the week,' when used in this chapter, is included all the time from midnight to midnight.

"The following acts, as explained in the next six sections, are those forbidden to be done on the first day of the week, excepting

a work of necessity or charity: No. 1, servile labor; No. 2, public sports and shows; No. 3, trades, manufactures, or mechanical employments; No. 4, public traffic; No. 5, serving process."

The terms, "servile labor," "works of necessity or charity," are drawn from the Catholic prescriptions for the observance of the day, and can be fairly construed by the courts only by the study of the opinions of Catholic doctors of moral theology, who have fixed the meaning of the terms and the limits to be assigned to them. Certainly there is nothing actually known as "servile" labor in New York at the present day. Nor will it do to go back to classic times, for the teachers and tutors in ancient Rome were generally of the slave class, and a Protestant Sunday-school teacher might be held to be guilty of "servile" labor. But the Catholic Church, construing her own laws, distinguishes between "servile" and "liberal" works, and recognizes a large class of works as "common." While the Church forbids servile works, she has not extended that prohibition to liberal works, and permits many that are common. The New York Code, using the word "servile," a word foreign to the common law, must intend it to be construed according to canon law,—the law of the Catholic Church, from which it is derived.

Servile works, in the eyes of the Church, are those which are effected principally by the bodily powers, and which tend directly to the advantage of the body. Liberal works are those in which the mind takes more part than the body, and which tend directly to the advantage of the mind, the cultivation of the intelligence. Common or natural works are those which are accomplished by both mind and body in about the same degree, and which are performed by all kinds of persons, without regard to social rank or calling.

Now, the Code, adopting a recognized term in Catholic theology, must be held to have done so knowingly; and as penal laws, according to a recognized maxim of law, must be construed strictly, the provision cannot be extended to liberal and common works, unless they are definitely and distinctly forbidden; they cannot be held to pass under the term "servile."

The claim will be made that this is a Protestant country, and that the attempt to evade or alter our Sunday laws is made by a foreign element, that has come of late years into the country, to break down the established institutions of this and other states. By the miserable subterfuge and falsification often resorted to, the Catholic body will be represented as made up entirely of foreigners, and as one of the opponents of the due observance of the Sunday. In this there is a fallacy at every step. The Catholics of the United States are not, as a body, foreign born; in fact, the majority of Catholics

here are native born; the American Catholics of New England origin alone number thousands, and those descended from settlers in other provinces in colonial days would swell the number beyond the range of mere thousands.

The Catholic Church created the Sunday and made the very regulations which have come down on the statute-books, and she still constantly, from her pulpits, her catechists' chairs, and the confessional, calls on her faithful to obey them, to sanctify the day, and refrain from all that desecrates it. If the Church has not all the moral influence over some of her children in this country that she desires, it is not her fault, but that of the very men who, hating her, seek to cripple her power for good, and tempt her children to disobey her regulations and flout her counsels.

But in her definition of her own law for the sanctification of the Lord's Day she must follow her own decisions of centuries; she cannot adopt the wild and exaggerated theories of those who try to enforce her laws according to their own interpretation, while actually denying her authority. She cannot take her interpretation of her own law from the "New York Sunday Closing Association," or any similar body.

She not only forbids servile work on the Lord's Day, and the spending of it in mere amusement and diversion, but she requires every member of her flock to take part in the offering of the great sacrifice of the new law, the highest act of worship that can be offered to Almighty God. She counsels prayer, devotion, acts of mercy, on that day. She multiplies churches to enable her children to fulfil the obligation of divine worship; by general and individual exhortation and rebuke she urges all to keep the day holy, and every Catholic knows that, by violating the command, he commits a mortal sin.

The Church and her children are not the habitual profaners of the Lord's Day. Not by her choice or her wish does the rail-car rattle noisily over surface-road or elevated rails past her temples at the moment when the worshipers within bow in awful silent adoration of the Son of God. No son of the Church, no Catholic does servile labor without necessity, or opens his place of business to sell his goods without knowing that he cuts himself off from the communion; that he can be admitted only by sincere repentance.

In New York the law preventing travel on Sunday was formerly, in the memory of many, so enforced as to prevent disturbing church service. There were then no street-cars, and any church could, by stretching a chain across the street at the commencement of its services, prevent vehicles passing till the congregation was dismissed. This was in time abandoned; but, solemn as the Catholic worship is in the eyes of her children, no

Catholic Church ever availed itself of this privilege, so far as we know, and, in point of fact, the attempt to exercise the right would have been resented, and led to trouble.

As the enforcement of the Sunday law relieved Jews who, by the provisions of the act, were exempt from penalty for working on Sunday if they kept the Saturday as their Sabbath, many of the children of Israel went a step further, and in quarters where they were numerous opened their stores and carried on traffic on Sunday. This has, of recent years, greatly changed the look of New York streets; the old Sunday, with its quiet, has disappeared, and men calling themselves still Christians were led to do what they saw their Hebrew neighbors do unchecked.

The right of a Jew to open his store on Sunday had been discussed in the case of The City of Shreveport against Levy. The court there determined "that before the constitution Jews and Gentiles are equal. By the law they must be treated alike, and the ordinance which gives to one sect a privilege which it denies to another, violates both the constitution and the law, and is therefore null and void." This doctrine has been generally accepted as sound, and was followed by the courts in New York, in recent decisions. Many Hebrew dealers have claimed the right to sell on that day, but their clergy do not advocate that view, and it is not probable that any legislation will enable them to do so, unless the Sunday is absolutely abolished.

For this, certainly, the American people are not prepared, and God forbid that we should live to see the time when it will be. But it is not easy to see on what ground the Sunday laws are to be maintained that will continue to commend itself to the growing secularism fostered by our public schools and state colleges.

One of our leading papers, discussing the question, says: "The assumption is, that by law we have here an established and characteristic Sabbath which everybody ought to be made to respect. But at the very foundation of this republic lies the separation of State and Church. Consequently, in the State of New York the first day of the week can only be regarded by the law as a day of rest, as a holiday. Legally it is that, and not a Sabbath which there is any religious obligation to keep. The State has nothing to do with its religious character, except so far as to protect citizens in their right to worship on Sunday without disturbance. Such other regulations as are justifiable are those only which are necessary because of its peculiar character as a weekly holiday."

This is very incorrect and fallacious. The separation of Church and State does not underlie the idea of our republic, either in theory or practice. The laws of the colonies bearing on Sunday were adopted by the States, and the United States government, in

the District of Columbia, adopted the laws of Virginia and Maryland. The early laws base their enactments distinctly and positively on religious grounds; they aimed to prevent the profanation of the Lord's day, not to regulate a state holiday. In Virginia, as in New England, attendance at Protestant service was commanded in the same law that forbade games and work; and the legislation that was directly intended to make men keep and fulfil a religious obligation, made regulations for its observance, and maintains them to this day, to the great good of all men, and more especially of the poorer classes, whose long life of labor would be cheerless indeed but for what the Church does to ameliorate their lot.

The Catholic churches are pre-eminently the churches of the poor; built up by their contributions, they are the noblest abiding-places that they have on earth. Within their walls the poor feel free; they speak of the churches, and point to them with pride as their own; within, all tends to cheer and elevate, to ennoble and to attract. It was the Church that in the Middle Ages gave the serf relief from grinding toil, gave him wherewith to cheer his dreary lot; her shrines were the spot where his mind received its sole elevating and ennobling influences. The Church did all for the poor, the state nothing.

But, in this matter of Sunday laws, how can the state act? The general government has no power over the subject at all throughout the country at large. It is one of the subjects over which each state retains complete control, and each state is free to unite Church and State, as most of them practically do. For years after the establishment of the United States government Massachusetts had her established church, and in other states the profession of the Protestant religion was necessary to the exercise of the elective franchise in its fullest extent. An eminent North Carolina lawyer, raised to the bench, found an act to prevent his taking the judicial position; a Catholic assemblyman, elected from New York City, could not take his seat in the state legislature; a Catholic cannot even now hold office in New Hampshire; in many states the Catholic inmates of penal and eleemosynary institutions are compelled to attend Protestant religious services, read Protestant bibles, sing Protestant hymns, and listen to instructions from Protestant ministers or turnkeys. Under the United States government Catholic soldiers and officers have been punished for refusing to attend Protestant worship, and Catholic soldiers are required by law to send their children to a Protestant chaplain for instruction.

The object of the earlier American law was not to secure to the piously-disposed quiet during the religious services that they attended, but to compel the indifferent, obstinate, and ill-disposed to

attend the service, whether Episcopal in Virginia or Congregational in New England, and to refrain from work, whether they wished it or not.

This legislation dates from a period when men believed that civil authority was instituted by God, and that civil rulers were responsible to God, and were bound to look after the spiritual welfare of their subjects. Under the Mosaic law the priests and the Sanhedrim, the oracle upon the ark, were the guide as to what was due to God's honor. For ages all Christian nations looked to the Catholic Church, and, as we have seen, the various states enforced by law her ordinances as to worship and cessation of labor on Sunday. Protestantism, in discarding the authority of the Church, has no good reason for its Sunday theory, and ought, logically, to keep Saturday as the Sabbath, with the Jews and Seventh-Day Baptists. For their present practice Protestants in general have no authority but that of a Church which they disown, and there cannot be a greater inconsistency than theirs in asking the state to enforce the Sunday laws.

If it be a mere state holiday, most of the legislative provisions are a mere tyrannical interference with the liberty of a citizen; and it is a strange holiday on which people are forbidden to enjoy themselves, under penalty of fine and imprisonment. If it were merely this, it would be more sensible to punish the man who wore a long face on a public holiday than the man who laughed.

It is not a mere legal holiday; it is the Lord's day, set apart by the Catholic Church. It is a religious holiday, and so long as it is maintained by law it is therefore only a sorry farce to tell us that in this country there is no union of Church and State.

The state, in referring to the Sunday laws, does it as a religious duty, acknowledging the Divine supremacy, and enforcing laws made known through the instrumentality of the Church. It was on this ground, and this ground alone, that the State of Connecticut, at the commencement of this century, arraigned the United States government as a Sabbath-breaker and profaner of the Lord's day. The carrying of mails through the State on Sunday had scandalized the good people of that commonwealth, and Connecticut attempted to prevent the general government from continuing its misconduct and to bring it to a sense of its sin. The local Sunday mails were stopped, and only those from distant points have since been carried.

IS SPIRITISM A DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIANITY?

Experimental Investigation of the Spirit Manifestations, etc. By Robert Hare, M.D. New York. Partridge & Brittain, 342 Broadway.

On Miracles and Modern Spiritualism. Three Essays. By Alfred Russel Wallace. James Burns, 15 Southampton Row. London. 1875.

Der Spiritismus und das Christenthum. Dr. J. Wieser, S. J., in Zeitschrift fuer Katholische Theologie. Innsbruck, Felician Rauch, 1880 and 1881.

ALL the extraordinary claims and promises of Spiritism are based upon the assumption that it is the complement and perfection of the Christianity of the past, inasmuch as it furnishes an interpretation and explanation of Christianity which will perfectly satisfy all generations to come. This interpretation consists in explaining away whatsoever has heretofore been accounted divine in the economy of Christianity, by the simple process of reducing its miracles and prophecies to Spiritist marvels, thus with one bold stroke bringing Christ, his prophets, and his saints, within the pale of Spiritism. This feat once accomplished, the cause of Spiritism is won. If Christ and the saints were Spiritists, Christianity is nothing but Spiritism, and Spiritism is the only philosophical religion that can satisfy the heart and mind of man. "Spiritism," we have heard Mr. Wallace say, in his eloquent conclusion to the essays, "takes up and explains whatever is true in the superstitions and so-called miracles of all ages. It and it alone is able to harmonize conflicting creeds, and it must ultimately lead to concord among mankind in the matter of religion, ... and it will be able to do this, because it appeals to evidence instead of faith, and substitutes facts for opinions, and is thus able to demonstrate the source of much of the teaching that men have so often held to be divine."

The argument of what is called the *Spiritist Analogy* is very simple, and may be briefly summarized as follows: The miracles and prophecies of Christ and of the saints are evidently marvels of Spiritism, if they are identical in nature with those marvels. Now this identity is self-evident, a mere comparison being sufficient to demonstrate a perfect parallelism.[1] For example: Christ healed the sick, so do our healing mediums; Christ walked upon the sea, our mediums hover in the air; Christ was transfigured on Thabor,

[1] Zoellner says that only a superficial knowledge of Spiritist phenomena is required in order to recognize in them a characteristic agreement (Uebereinstimmung) with the miracles recorded of Christ. Wissensch. Abh. B. III., p. 612.

our mediums are frequently transfigured in halos of "odyllic" light; Christ turned water into wine, so do our spirits; Christ read the hearts of men, so do our mediums; Christ prophesied, so do our mediums. Therefore, the miracles and prophecies of Christ, and, by parity, of the saints, are only Spiritist marvels, and Christianity is only an old form of Spiritism. Such is the gist of the argument which the defenders of the Spiritist Analogy develop now in one way, now in another, now by a suggestive insinuating style imperceptibly instilling a multitude of doubts into the minds of the unwary, now with a bold, eloquent, and learned tone, carrying away unsettled minds to belief.

In order to pass a just judgment upon the argument of Spiritists, it is necessary to go back to the fundamental truths which reason dictates concerning miracles and marvels, and review such of them as are indispensable for our present discussion.

A miracle, from *mirari*, in the broadest and loosest acceptation of the word, is anything that elicits great admiration, be it in the physical, intellectual, or moral order. Thus we speak of miracles of nature, of learning, or of virtue. In a more limited sense the word stands for a wonderful effect, that is contrary to what one would have expected, and is produced by a hidden cause.[1] Now, as the cause may be either God or a creature, we have two classes of wonderful effects, of which the divine alone are, according to universal custom, called *miracles*, while those of creatures are properly denominated *marvels*. Since, however, we do not call divine works miracles unless they transcend the order existing in nature, a miracle is further limited to the strictest signification of "*an effect that transcends the power and order of all created nature.*"[2] Hence, while a marvel is an effect that is produced by the limited strength of a creature, a miracle, on the contrary, can only be wrought by the omnipotence of God.

Reason teaches that God, because He is almighty, can work three kinds of miracles: He can produce, 1, miraculous effects which no created being could ever cause; 2, effects which might be produced by a creature, but are caused without it; 3, effects which He makes the creature produce, contrary to those it would naturally cause.[3] Thus, God alone can raise the dead to life, alone can heal diseases without medicine, alone can make boiling oil refresh and invigorate His beloved disciple. To say that God cannot work miracles of the first class, is to deny his boundless power; to object that the order of nature forbids any inter-

---

1 *V.* D. Thom. Qq. disp. de miraculis, a. 2.

2 *V.* S. Th. 1. p. q. 105, a. 7. Contra Gent. l. 3, c. 101.

3 *V.* Mazzella, De Religione. Disp. I., Art. IX. *V.* Liberatore, Cosmol., chap. iv.

ference on the part of God in miracles of the second and third classes, is to suppose that He is not its Creator and absolute Master; to maintain that His attributes are opposed to a miraculous suspension or setting aside of the laws of nature, is to dwarf those attributes, as if, forsooth, God neither knew by His omniscience, nor was generous enough in His goodness, nor had the power with His omnipotence, to make such changes in His work as He chose, and, above all, to create a world of supernatural miracles upon and above this universe of natural wonders. So far from seeing any difficulty in admitting the possibility of this higher creation, reason would rather expect its actual production from Him of whose wonders there can be no end. God certainly needed not to have created anything at all, being all-sufficient for Himself; but once He put forth His creative power in order to manifest His glory, there is no reason why that power should not work greater and still greater wonders, being, as it is, infinite in its might and beneficence. That supernatural economy which reason might have looked for the Christian knows to be an accomplished fact. It was not the reason of Hume, Renan, and Strauss that rejected the possibility of divine miracles; it was their will, that denied it against their reason, and against fact. They knew very well that scores of divine miracles had been verified upon the testimony of reliable witnesses, that they were undeniable historical facts, which, as they could not be overthrown by reason, had to be scouted as "*intractable* facts of history;" words which alone show the bad faith of that school of atheistic writers.

Given a number of wonderful effects, how can we discriminate which of them come from God and which do not? In the first place, if the prodigy be such that it could not possibly be the work of any creature, it is, beyond a doubt, a divine miracle of the first class. Thus, the miraculous restoration of lost limbs and organs, or their production where they never existed, the raising of the dead to life, and the changing of the hardened heart of a man, are indisputably miracles that can be wrought by God alone. In the second place, if the effects are such as could not possibly be caused by any creature in the *manner* in which they are caused, they cannot but be divine miracles of the second and third classes. Thus, if an effect is produced without pre-existing matter, or without the potencies of matter, or by means in themselves inadequate, it is plainly the work of Omnipotence alone. Thus, God alone can heal an incurable disease, without using any remedy; the creature cannot. God can make the white heat of the furnace, against its natural power, cool the body of a martyr; the creature cannot. God can cure diseases with a word, or give sight to a man born blind by putting mud on his eyeballs; a creature cannot. Where

such effects are at all possible to created power, they can only be caused with the assistance of matter and its potencies, and by means proportionate to the effect. Thus, a spirit might cure certain diseases, to all appearances, suddenly, but not without the assistance of some kind of matter, not at all if there is no potentiality for a cure, and never without proportionate means; in these cases Omnipotent power alone can accomplish the work.

It is, therefore, raising a false supposition to object that, in order to ascertain that a certain prodigy could not have been the work of a creature, one ought to be acquainted with everything that creatures can accomplish; for the point to be settled is, not what creatures can do, but what they *cannot do*, and that has been defined in the law laid down above. Even granting that there may be latent forces in nature, as yet unexplored by science, it always remains certain that they can never exceed the limits of created strength. Even the angels, confessedly the highest and most powerful creatures, cannot be exempted from that eternal law, "that a finite cause cannot produce an infinite effect;" or again, "that a finite cause cannot work an effect in an *infinite manner*." It is true that the wonderful knowledge and the extraordinary power over matter with which pure spirits are endowed, enable the angels, whether good or bad, to work, with God's permission, wonders so similar to the miracles of the second and third class, as to expose the incautious to deception. This fact, however, only points out the danger of unreasoning credulity and rash judgment to those whose education has not fitted them to cope with the difficulty; but it cannot invalidate the principal criterion, "that a creature cannot work in an omnipotent manner," how difficult soever it makes its application in practice. The practical difficulties that are inseparable from the examination of such marvels, are acknowledged by divines, whose prudent hesitation to accept every wonder as genuine has often brought upon them the false accusation that they have little faith in miracles. Surely, the Church has the strongest faith in miracles, but not before they have stood those crucial tests of the Roman Rota whose severity has become proverbial.

It would be beside the purpose of our present consideration to inquire how far good and bad angels are allowed to interfere with the order of the universe. Reason assures us that they cannot create a disturbance in the existing harmony of nature without the permission of the Master of the universe. That they are allowed so to exert their activity, and how, and to what degree, was discussed in a previous article.[1] For the present it is enough to

[1] Article on the Spirit-world, Quarterly for October, 1881.

bear in mind that they are actually at work, around and about us, and that their marvels must always be taken into account in the practical examination of miracles.

Another mark by which the marvel of a creature may, in many cases, be at once distinguished from divine miracles, is the *end or purpose for which it is wrought.* In working His miracles, God must always have a good and worthy purpose, whether it be to manifest His attributes, or to prove that it is He that speaks in revelation, or to corroborate that revelation over and over again, or to vindicate slandered virtue, or to set the seal of the divinity upon the sanctity of his saints. It is evident that the end or purpose, whatsoever it be, for which God works a miracle cannot but be good and worthy of Him.

On the other hand, the end for which a creature works a marvel may be evil and unworthy of God. It is not necessarily so, but it *may* be so; and, if it is so, the marvel cannot come from God, for He cannot give the power of working miracles to a creature for an evil and unworthy purpose. A prodigy, therefore, which is plainly caused for an evil purpose, or, for an end unworthy of God, cannot be a divine miracle.

From the principles thus far examined reason deduces the following *differences* between miracles and marvels:

1. The power that works miracles must be omnipotent; that which causes marvels is finite.

2. God alone can work miracles of the first class; no finite cause can produce such an infinite effect.

3. God alone can cause marvellous effects of the second and third class in an omnipotent manner; a creature may cause them only in a finite manner.

4. The *omnipotent manner* of working miracles knows no limits; the *finite manner* of working marvels is limited to pre-existing matter, *and* to its potencies, *and* to proportionate means.

5. The end or purpose of divine miracles cannot but be good, and worthy of God; the end or purpose of a creature's marvels may be the contrary.

It is by these canons of reason that the miracles of Christ and of the saints have been tested by the acutest minds of the Christian world for well-nigh two thousand years, and been proved to be divine; it is by the same canons that the marvels of evil spirits have been unmasked, their claims to identity with miracles overthrown, and their whole nature and tendency branded as execrable *magic*, so that the philosophy of miracles and marvels is not only written in abstract reason, but stands embodied in history.

Passing on to the polemical view of the subject, reason draws

from the philosophy and history of miracles and marvels the following pertinent conclusions:

1. That to exclude divine miracles from the definition and philosophy of miracles is to pervert and distort both, in violation of the canons of reason, of history, and of religion; and that to do so in order to support a foregone conclusion proves the weakness and iniquity of the cause.

2. That to ignore, or conceal, or misrepresent, the essential *difference between the powers* that work miracles and marvels, in order to identify the latter with the former, is a violation of the same canons, either through culpable ignorance or from a wilful but concealed intention to deceive.

3. That to ignore, or conceal, or misrepresent the essential *difference in the manner of production* of miracles and marvels must be regarded as dishonest.

4. That to ignore, or conceal, or misrepresent whole classes of miracles because they baffle a certain purpose, is to hide the truth in order that falsehood may prevail.

5. That to ignore, or conceal, or misrepresent the historical miracles of the first class, because there are no marvels like them, is, moreover, a direct violation of the religious rights of God and of man.

6. That to ignore, conceal, or misrepresent the ends and purposes of miracles and marvels, is an impious attempt to make God no better than the creature.

These are the charges which we lay at the door of the defenders of the Spiritist Analogy.

In the first place, Spiritists pervert the definition and philosophy of miracles, by excluding the works of God from both. Following the definition given by Spinoza and Locke, that a miracle "is an event whose cause cannot be explained by the *natural laws known to us*, and which *seems* to be opposed to those laws," Spiritists assign as the only cause of those events the spirits of the séances. Thus, Mr. Wallace expressly defines miracles when he says "Every action and occurrence which involves the existence and activity of a superhuman intelligence we call a miracle," and by "superhuman intelligence" he means nothing but a spirit, for we have heard him say, in his conclusion to the *Essays*, that the marvels of spiritism "explain whatever is true in the superstitions and so-called miracles of all ages." Moreover, since, by a fundamental article of the Spiritist Revelation, God has nothing to do with His creatures, He and His works must be excluded from the consideration of miracles, if Spiritists would be at all consistent. This, however, cannot be done without breaking down the barriers of reason and historical facts. If Spiritists, notwithstanding, pervert the

definition and philosophy of miracles by excluding from both the works of God, they do so in order to sustain their foregone conclusion, that all historical miracles belong to Spiritism. A proceeding so unfair argues the weakness of their cause; a measure so unjust against man and God proves its iniquity.

In the second place, Spiritists ignore or conceal, or misrepresent the essential differences that actually exist between the wonder-working *power* of Christ, and that of the spirits of the séances.

The first difference is in the *genesis* of that power. In the power of Christ there is no trace of the genesis peculiar to the power of the spirits. In Him there was no mediumistic current induced by locked hands, no cataleptic state, no mediumistic dependence on a higher power, no development of mediumistic gifts, nothing of all that mediumistic genesis, but calm, conscious, ready, certain, personal, independent, absolute, universal, unlimited power; in one word, an almighty will.

The second difference is the *certainty* of Christ's power, as opposed to the capriciousness of mediumistic influence. His power never forsook Him, never failed Him: it was His own will.

These two differences are so striking that some Spiritists have endeavored to explain them, not by putting them fairly before the reader, but by covering them with the gratuitous *hypothesis*—for it is worth no more than that—that Christ was *spirit and medium in one*. Thus Perty, in trying to explain the resurrection, ascension, and sending of the Holy Ghost, says: "Christ is unique, inasmuch as He needs no Spiritist circle, no medium, to furnish the matter requisite for materialization; He took the matter out of the constituents of His own body, which afterwards dissolved itself without leaving a trace."—*Der Jetzige Spiritualismus und Verwandte Erfahrungen der Vergangenheit und Gegenwart*, p. 218.

After quoting this explanation, Dr. Wieser sternly demands (l. c., p. 120), "Why, if Christ stood in no need of *Spiritist means*, why must one lay hold of such a stupid proposition, in order, notwithstanding, to make Him, by force, a Spiritist?"

The third difference is the unlimited range in the power of Christ, as opposed to what may be termed the *mediumistic specialties*. It is an established fact, that mediums are always limited to certain classes of phenomena, that they are always specialists, but, unlike the specialists of the professions, they are wholly unable to accomplish anything outside of their special sphere. Moreover, the spirits are bound down to these special powers of the mediums, so that Spiritism presents a curious collection of small powers, each circumscribed by impassable barriers. The power of Christ, on the contrary, knew no limits but those it set for itself. It was varied and universal, and, extending over all created nature, whether ani-

mate or inanimate, proclaimed Him to be its Master. What a spectacle that must have been to the Jews, when Christ came before them from His thirty years of hidden life, the obscure son of a carpenter, from despised Nazareth, a man who had not whereon to lay His head, but who proclaimed Himself and proved Himself to be God Incarnate! The son of the carpenter lifted up His hand, and proved His dominion over all creatures. Inanimate nature obeyed Him. He changed water into wine; at His voice the raging sea calmed itself about his bark; He walked on the sea, and made it firm as the shore; He made five loaves of bread feed five thousand men. Men were subject to His power, body and soul. He stretched forth His hand, or lifted up His voice, or merely said "I will," and cured every ill that flesh is heir to. He changed the soul of Matthew. He baffled the fury and craft of His enemies, and exposed their most secret thoughts. He made the departed soul return and reanimate the dead body. Spirits were subject to Him, for with a word He cast them out of the possessed, made them obey, nay, made them beg to be allowed to enter the bodies of swine. In one word, Christ proved His absolute dominion over all creatures by the exercise of omnipotent power. How the petty specialties of Spiritism sink away into insignificance beside this unlimited power! Yet Spiritists ignore this tremendous difference, or they conceal it; not because it has no significance, but because its weight in argument would crush them. If, therefore, they thus violate the canons of reason, of history, and of religion, it must be from a wilful, but concealed, intention to deceive. If they plead ignorance, it is an ignorance of the most guilty kind.

In the third place, Spiritists ignore, or conceal, or misrepresent, the essential difference in the *manner of production* of the miracles of Christ and of *their* (the Spiritists') marvels. Under this head we consider only those miracles of Christ which belong to the second and third class. Now, the manner of working these miracles is as different from that of the marvels as omnipotence is from the weakness of created strength. This would follow *a priori* from the essential difference between the respective powers, for essentially different causes must have essentially different ways of working; but there is not much need of reasoning on this point, since the difference of manner is a fact so well established that it needs only to be pointed out to be at once accepted by an unbiassed mind. The fact is recorded in the best-authenticated of all histories, the New Testament. The manner in which every miracle of Christ is wrought surpasses at the first glance all the possibilities of created power. Christ does not need matter to work with, much less its potencies, and least of all proportionate means: His power is so boundless that it sets these at naught. He has no spirits to assist

Him, much less to do the work for Him, though legions of angels stood ready at His beck. Empty handed He showers upon His people the gifts of God with the power of God. At the wedding feast of Cana He turns water into wine. It is claimed that the same marvel was wrought in a séance at Boston; but everybody conversant with the annals of Spiritism knows that the spirits themselves explain all such marvels by rapid transportation. They spirit away the water, and put wine in its place; but they do not pretend to, nay they cannot, *turn* water into wine by the mere power of their will, for that requires the power of the Author of nature. Again, Christ healed incurable diseases instantaneously, by means wholly inadequate, with a touch, or a word, very often without any means at all, but simply by His will. The wonderworkers of Spiritism are so pitifully limited in the healing art that they can only diagnose diseases, and point out or apply the proper remedies (which every physician of some experience can do), or at best work some very questionable cures by means of mesmeric passes. Hence, the healing marvels have not produced anything like a deep impression, even upon the minds of the most credulous. Spiritism cannot produce one healing marvel which can furnish a shadow of comparison with the manner in which Christ cured all kinds of diseases. Spiritists, like all professed sophists, studiously conceal and misrepresent these irreconcilable and damaging points of difference. To say that Christ did not walk on the sea, but hovered over it, and that, after the peculiar experience of St. Peter, is about as shameless a misrepresentation of an historic fact as could be devised by an unfair mind.[1] To say that Christ's transfiguration on Thabor was nothing but a halo of odyllic lights—those spectral flames of gloomy séances—is equally disgraceful.[2] Yet these were the strongest points Spiritists could make; what, then, would they do with the grander miracles of Christ? In explaining them they no longer argue, but merely affirm; and their affirmations are only stupid hypotheses. We have seen how Perty managed to surmount the difficulties of the resurrection and ascension of Christ, and of the sending of the Paraclete, with the bold assumption that Christ was spirit and medium in one. Zoellner does not need even that assumption; he explains the awe-inspiring miracles that attended the death of Christ by simply attributing them to the spirits, taking it for sound logic that *qui potest minus potest magis*, though he would not dare to say it in so many words. It is wrong, however, for the colleagues of

[1] Perty says (l. c.): "Christ's and Peter's walking upon the sea of Tiberias could have been *ecstatic hovering*. According to Matthew and Mark, Jesus, after dismissing the multitude, had previously prayed alone on the mountain, and that may have accelerated the development of that power which enabled him to hover."

[2] Zoellner explains the transfiguration of Thabor as a materialization séance.

Zoellner to blame him for letting his zeal run away with his discretion: they are all guilty of the same fault, only they know better how to conceal it than the headlong Zoellner.

It is worth remembering that, if the miracles of Christ are to be explained by mere *hypotheses*, there is no reason why the infidel should not fling this scoff in the teeth of Spiritists: "I explain those miracles with the hypothesis of mere trickery and deception; and I explain your marvels by the same hypothesis; if you merely *suppose*, I can do so with equal right." In fact, if an explanation is to be *imagined*, many others besides that of the Spiritists can be imagined just as well; but imagining is not reasoning.

In the fourth place, Spiritists ignore, or conceal, or misrepresent, whole categories of miracles of the second and third classes, because they baffle their purpose. We saw under the last charge how Spiritists argue from the water and wine trick of the Boston séance, as also from the diagnoses and cures made by healing mediums, inferring from the first that the marvels explain the miracles of Christ wrought in inanimate nature, and from the second those performed in the bodies of men. These specious conclusions, however, could not stand if the comparison were carried a step further, for there are miracles like which there are no marvels in all Spiritism. Therefore Spiritists either ignore them, or positively misrepresent them. For instance, there is a studied silence as to those miraculous commands over inanimate nature in which the storm and the sea obeyed their Lord; indeed, to mention them would be enough to break down the great analogy. Again, Spiritists carefully avoid letting their dupes know that perhaps the greater number of Christ's miraculous cures were of diseases that are incurable even by the marvels of Spiritism. Yet surely none of the miracles of Christ go home to man's heart so strongly and so tenderly as those which in the simple Gospel record are summed up in the few words of Christ, Matth. xi., "the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear." In default of such marvels Spiritists resort to their usual unfair method of ignoring or misrepresenting the miracles of Christ that thwart their purposes, and that is nothing more or less than dishonestly to conceal or misrepresent the truth, in order that falsehood may be made to prevail.

In the fifth place, Spiritists ignore, conceal, or misrepresent the historical miracles of Christ that belong to the first class. Spiritists have no marvels to compare with these effects of Omnipotence. No creature has the power to change the heart of man at will; yet Christ, with a little scourge, struck terror into the crowds of buyers and sellers, and drove them out of the temple; He defied the infuriated multitude that had taken up stones to stone Him; He created a new heart in Magdalen; He passed the publican at his

money-table and merely said, "follow me," and Matthew instantly arose and followed Him. True, "He spoke as no man ever spoke," but it was not as an orator, who labors to win his cause, that He spoke; He spoke "as one having authority;" He spoke as no man ever spoke, or will speak, or can speak, for He spoke as God. Sole master of health, He alone could give it back where nature had already entirely lost it. Sole master of the body of man, He alone could restore its lost faculties. Sole master of man's soul, He alone could make it return and join the decayed body, and rise once more in its flesh to live. Sole Lord of spirits, He cast them out at will, and made them obey His word. Sole master of life and death, He alone could lay down His life, and take it up again. The omnipotent God alone can, of His own power, work such miracles.

What analogy can Spiritists find for these miracles? They have found none. Most of them ignore these miracles of the first class, while the few who, like Perty and Zoellner, attempt to explain them, grossly misrepresent them by their insipid hypotheses. For the intentional omission or misrepresentation of the miracles of Christ there can be no excuse. The miracles of Christ are all authenticated historical facts, and if Spiritists mean to appropriate them, they must prove their claims to all of them without exception, and if they would make good those claims, they may not omit, conceal, or misrepresent a single one. If, then, Spiritists violate these self-evident principles, in defiance of reason and of history, in a matter that involves the religious rights of God and of man, what must we think of their honesty and their good faith?

In the sixth place, Spiritists entirely ignore the essential difference between the ends and purposes of the miracles of Christ and those of the marvels of the spirits. Spiritists have no right to pass over this consideration. Intelligent beings, as such, always act with an intention, which specifies and distinguishes their actions from those of irrational beings, and in the moral order specifies and distinguishes them from one another. If the miracles of Christ are marvels of Spiritism, they must have been wrought for the same ends and purposes as are the marvels; if they were wrought for ends diametrically opposite, Christ worked with an intention opposite to that of the spirits, and there must be an irreconcilable antagonism between Him and the spirits, between His miracles and their marvels. Now, this antagonism exists in fact. The uses to which Spiritist marvels have been put are well known, and will be here specified only by contrast with the purposes of Christ. Christ never, even when it might have saved His life, wrought a miracle to *satisfy the curiosity* of the mob or of the

great. Rather than pander to the *sensationalism* of Herod Antipas and his profligate court, and so gain their protection, He preferred to be set at naught by them, and to be accounted a fool. He never made his miracles *minister to the earthly aggrandizement* of Himself or His own; rather He used them to pour out the gifts of nature with the bounty of God upon the unfortunate, and remaining poor Himself, He enriched men with the inestimable treasures of health, and life, and grace. He aimed not at *wealth*, or *fame*, or *pleasure*, or any of the *baser* ends of spiritist marvels, but directed all His miracles to the one great end of making men *believe in Him*, so that they might receive salvation through Him. This sublime purpose He embodied in that divinely designed plan in which doctrines and miracles were blended with infinite foresight and wisdom to achieve their proper success. His were no precarious tentative efforts. Place, time, and circumstances were chosen by Him beforehand for His miracles, their effects, and the doctrines for which they were to prepare minds; at times He chained miracles to miracles in preconceived and prearranged order of succession; now He chose to work them before a few, another time before multitudes; He often forbade the publication of miracles, but sometimes even made Himself known as their author; but He always and everywhere directed His miracles to the one great end of His mission as Saviour of the world. He made every miracle the prologue of omnipotence to His divine teachings, increasing the splendor and greatness of the miracles in proportion as the doctrines that were to follow demanded stronger faith. It was thus that after the many miracles by which He cured "the very great multitude who were come to hear Him and to be healed of their diseases" (Luke vi.), He lifted up his eyes on His disciples to pronounce the poor and unfortunate in this life blessed. It was after feeding five thousand men with five loaves that He demanded of them implicit faith, and made the solemn promise of giving His own body and blood for the food of eternal life in the Eucharist (John vi.). Faith in Him was not, as Spiritists assert, a *physical condition* for the exercise of His miraculous power, but the very effect and end intended by His miracles. He often showed that His miraculous power did not require faith in the subjects and recipients of His favors, as when He took pity on the man who "had been eight and thirty years under his infirmity" (John v.), or more touching still, on the widow of Naim, and again in the many instances when He rewarded the faith of others by working miracles for those who had no faith. He exacted faith in Him as his due, as the supreme homage that had to be given Him as God; but He did not need it as a *physical* condition for the actuation or exercise of His power, as is the case with magicians and Spiritists. How the

doctrines to which Christ directed all His miracles contradict those supported by the marvels of the spirits was plainly seen in the examination of the Spiritist Revelation. How the great end of all the miracles of Christ, which is nothing but the creation of the Christian world, is hostile to the purpose of all Spiritist marvels, which is to unchristianize the world, must be evident to every Christian, and indeed to every fair mind that knows the nature of Christianity and of Spiritism. Spiritists were fully cognizant of this invincible antagonism from the very beginning of their work; but the word had gone forth to them to ignore, to conceal, to deny it, and make it appear that Christ and Christianity are their friends in the common brotherhood of Spiritism. Knowingly and wilfully, then, they attempt to conceal the end and purpose of Christ's miracles, in order to pull Him down to the level of a medium-spirit, in order to make God no better than the creature, or rather to bring Him down to the spirits of hell.[1] After such impiety we need not be astonished to hear Spiritists advocate the blasphemous hypothesis that Christ labored under the hallucination, before and after death, that He was the Messias.[2]

To sum up, the whole argument of Spiritists comes to this:

Christ worked the wonderful effects, x, y, z (and a thousand greater miracles, which need not be insisted upon).

But the spirits can do something like the x, y, z.

Ergo, the spirits can do all that Christ did.

Ergo, Christ and his miracles belong to Spiritism.

This is *Spiritist logic*.

Ergo, Spiritists conclude, by parity, the miracles of the saints of Christianity belong to Spiritism. However, there is no longer a *sequitur* to their false premises, and the simple answer is that, by parity, the miracles of the saints cannot belong to Spiritism; Christ lost, they have lost the saints. Since Spiritists have not taken the trouble to examine the miracles of the saints, we are relieved of the disagreeable duty of following their vagaries any further. However, as some of them single out the circumstance that the saints confessed that they worked miracles by a power

---

[1] C. v. Rappard writes: "The Spiritist acknowledges the moral perfection of the missionary of Nazareth, ... but at the same time also the vocation of all spirits to reach the same degree of perfection. Thus the divinity of Christ as well as our own is clearly defined." He adds that there is no difference of opinion on this point among the Spiritists of France, Belgium, Italy, Spain, and other countries.

[2] Perty not only says that Christ "shared the hopes of his people in the Messias," and labored under the hallucination that He was the Messias, but even carried that deception with Him into the other world. "Even after the resurrection, and therefore as a spirit, did he hold fast to the Messias-conception that had originated in him, precisely as the spirits of other departed men cling to their notions and interests" (l. c., p. 218).

outside of them, and triumphantly point to it as a plain case of "medium and spirit," it is necessary to refute this insinuation. For this purpose nothing more is required than a glance at the great figures of the saints that stand out so prominently in history. What grand copies of Christ they are! In them, again, there is not a trace of the mediumistic conditions, no experimenting, no limitation to one set of phenomena, no ostentation and hankering after fame, no greed for money, no freeloveism, no blasphemy nothing of all that corruption which "reeks of the rotten fens of hell;" but here are men and women, youths and maidens,[1] of heroic virtue, most of them voluntarily poor, almost all of them despised and persecuted by the wicked, yet all of them working the most astounding miracles, not in cataleptic contortions but in their normal state, even as Christ, healing all kinds of incurable diseases, forcing the elements to obey them, casting out evil spirits, and bidding the dead arise, in the power and the name, not of a spirit, but of Jesus Christ. History never once records that a saint worked a miracle with the assistance of the spirits of Spiritism; that slander comes from Spiritists, who learned it from those old pagans who attributed the miracles of the early Christians to magical arts, or from the Pharisees, who in impotent rage cried out that Christ worked His miracles in the power of Beelzebub. History repeats itself, and Spiritists only re-enact the darkest side of it; the only difference is that they call the devils spirits, and magic Spiritism.

Passing from miracles to prophecies, let us see what Spiritists claim to do. They cannot appeal to a single fact to show that a spirit or medium ever "foreknew and predicted with certainty a future event which could not be known from its natural causes," that is, ever prophesied or foretold the *free* future actions of God or of man, which is genuine prophecy.[2] In this respect Spiritists have no points of comparison with the great prophecies of Christ and of his saints. Yet they claim them; but it stands to reason that until they can bring forward at least one genuine prophecy, demonstrating a sure and certain foreknowledge of a future act that depends on the full will of man or of God, verified by the event, their claims to the prophecies of Christ and the Saints are gratuitous assertions.

And so the grand Spiritist Analogy falls to the ground, and behind it stands the terrible reality,—demons at work, the mediums

[1] On this subject Dr. Wieser remarks in a note (l. c., p. 123): "The so-called mediumistic endowment is more commonly found in women than in men. Among the canonized saints of the Church who shone by their miracles the men are, on the contrary, by far in the majority. Providence knows why it has made this disposition."

[2] Mazzella, De Religione, Disp. i., art. xi.

possessed by them, *diablerie* and *possession*, while over against them stands their victorious enemy, the wonder-working Church of Christ, who, from the days of her Founder, has exerted her miraculous power most strikingly in the deliverance of the possessed.

And thus falls the whole claim of Spiritism to Christianity, a claim which, though insulting and blasphemous, is certainly a magnificent recognition by the very powers of darkness and their votaries of the unrivalled empire that Christianity holds over the heart and mind of civilized man.

Conclusion.

The real nature, claims, and promises of Spiritism.

After carefully studying the nature of modern Spiritism, two most consoling conclusions force themselves upon the Christian mind.

The first conclusion is that the hand of God is upon the spirits of Spiritism. The great natural powers of these evil spirits, which mankind has always acknowledged in its beliefs and practices, and which, as was seen elsewhere,[1] are recognized by the Church, are evidently curtailed and crippled by Almighty God in a most humiliating manner. If those spirits were allowed to exert their entire strength at pleasure, modern Spiritism would be formidable indeed. Their power over matter, their knowledge of physical nature, their insight into the imagination of man, their accumulated experiences of centuries, are such as, if manifested to their full extent, would appal the world. The marvels which the evil spirits of Spiritism *might* work would shake the faith of many, and will one day, as we are forewarned, be the actual power of Antichrist. But as yet the hand of God is upon the spirits, and those fallen archangels and angels that once thought themselves great enough to claim some equality with God are condemned to the abject condition of the gibbering ghosts of the séances, and must be contented to be received and treated, even by their friends, as the scum of the spirit-world. They are compelled to be the slaves of cataleptic mediums. They are permitted to make a revelation, yet so that it may be seen at once to be a web of falsehoods and contradictions. They are allowed to work marvels, but are forced by God to defeat their purpose by explaining the manner in which they are wrought. *Their power over matter, their knowledge of the forces of nature, their keen insight into the actions of men, and their perception of man's imagination, are their own explanations of those marvels, and destroy every pretension to the miraculous.* They are thus enabled to per-

[1] *V.* article on the Spirit-world, Quarterly for October, 1881.

form all the feats of rapid locomotion of material objects, to produce writing on paper or sounds in the air, to possess the mediums and make their tongues speak unknown languages, or reveal distant events, to read the imaginations of the bystanders, or tell past events concerning them which they know by remembrance, to make shrewd conjectures of what may come to pass in a short time, to diagnose diseases which they have seen for thousands of years, to compress the air into spirit-forms,—in a word, to perform all the feats of the séances in a perfectly natural manner. But how little, how ignoble, these tricks are, coming, as they do, from fallen archangels and angels! Why do they not fling off the chains that bind them, and without servility to a cataleptic medium come and go among their own as they list, and putting forth the full strength of their nature make men do their will? The hand of God is upon them. They may tempt man, but not beyond his strength. Therefore are they permitted by God to practice the highest arts of deception, but in such wise that the deception is palpable, and can harm none save those who are willing to be deceived.

The second conclusion is that the hand of God is upon Spiritism, and has stricken it with that intellectual and moral leprosy which is ever the punishment of culpable and obstinate rebellion against his law. Already have the false doctrines and heresies of thirty-four years of modern Spiritism outstripped those of all the Protestant Reformers since the days of Luther, and taken their place beside the absurdities of Pantheism accumulated since the time of Xenophanes; already have its extensive outbreaks of public immorality brought upon it the severe castigation of civil justice, and driven it back into its midnight chambers; already have the enormities of its secret demon-worship caused historians to rank it with ancient Gnosticism or downright paganism; already has Spiritism, instead of satisfying the good heart and the right reason of man, proved itself a deadly poison to both. Indeed, it cannot be otherwise; Spiritism, being the work of Satan, is, by its very nature, a curse.

Its triumphs are the victories of the powers of darkness, yet even those victories are only apparent. The triumph over materialism is only apparent. According to Mr. Wallace, "evidence" is substituted for "faith," and, therefore, as Dr. Wieser correctly infers (l. c., p. 709), "what one cannot touch possesses no value. Wherefore, the distance from materialism is only apparent; the existence of spirits is accepted, but they are mostly understood to be only beings of finer matter; a future state is acknowledged, but only on condition that it be a more pleasant earthly or planetary existence. Materialism, therefore, continues to exist." Much

more is the victory over Christians only apparent, for it will be found, upon closer scrutiny, that the victims of Spiritism are mostly unbaptized, and they surely cannot be called Christians. Such a triumph is no novelty in the world. According to Christian doctrine the unbaptized belong to Satan, and the religious history of unbaptized peoples demonstrates that Satan has enjoyed among them a worship not unlike that of Spiritism. What wonder, then, that the devil claims his own, even among those who call themselves Christians, but who are not even baptized?[1] The triumphs of Spiritism, such as they are, only give the devil his due; but just on that account Spiritism is, by its very nature, a curse.

Claiming the name of Religion, though it gives no worship to God, it substitutes a rabble of low spirits for God as the object of man's worship, the grossest falsehoods for God's infallible revelations, tricks and juggling marvels for Divine miracles, the feverish frenzy of the séances for rational worship, and an ignominious future for bliss everlasting. Such doctrines can never satisfy the deep yearnings of man's soul; the wild bacchanal of Spiritism must end, like every drunken revel, in a complete prostration of man's faculties; and, sick of the mad whirl, he will either despair or embrace Nihilism. Such is the religious claim of Spiritism.

Spiritism pretends to indorse or enhance the moral teaching of Christ, but in reality abolishes it in principle and in practice. The boast that it has vindicated the immortality of the soul against the false philosophy of Materialism can in no wise hide its sophistries. The immortality vindicated by Spiritism is, in its religious and moral effects, not a whit better than the annihilation of Materialism. The certainty of immortality does not, of itself, make men religiously or morally better. The thought of living forever cannot, of itself, terrify a debauched Spiritist, who believes that his revels and wassails shall continue unchecked by conscience through a round of incarnations yet to come. According to his revelation, there is no moral responsibility even, let alone an eternal law and its sanction in the reward of heaven, or the punishment of hell. No matter how wicked the Neros have been, even they must ascend into the region of "the star of light and beauty"[2] unto perfect purity and happiness. Live as you list, sin as you will, for there is

---

[1] The fact that Spiritism has filled its ranks with unbaptized descendants of Christian parents throws a new light, not only on the necessity of baptism, but also on the divine virtue of the baptismal character. For pertinent teachings of the Fathers on this subject see Father De Augustinis's *De Re Sacramentaria. Trac. I. De Sacramentis in Genere. Pars. III, Art. VI. De Charactere Sacramentali.*

[2] According to Koons's revelations, "the region, called the 'Star of Light and Beauty,' signifies the unpenetrable, the inconceivable, the source, fountain and centre of all light, heat, life, force, gravitation, and attraction, . . . in a word, the profound mystery, . . . summed up in the grand, solvent name of God."

nothing to restrain or forbid you, and in the end your reward shall be exceeding great; this is the moral code that is the sequel of the immortality preached by Spiritism. Lo, the pillow of sin, upon which man may sleep soundly! There is neither a God nor a Satan to disturb his slumbers; the very sound of the word hell is unknown, and even the shell of conscience has lost its echo. "If man durst shape his destiny according to his wishes, were not this," Mr. Wallace somewhere writes, "all that he could desire?" Yea, verily; for so it has ever been the vain wish of the sinner "that hell should never be."

The actual outbreaks of the immorality of Spiritism are known at least to Americans.

Whensoever it found itself unrestrained by the presence of chaste Christianity it broke out into the most disgraceful bacchanalia that the world has witnessed since the days of Nero's Rome. The Mountain Cove, the Kiantone Movement, the New Motive Power, the Sacred Order of Unionists, the Order of the Patriarchs, and worst of all, the Arkansas Angelites, are known to the English-speaking world as specimens of the full development of Spiritist immorality. They were so many attempts to establish "little kingdoms of heaven upon earth," such as Spiritism promises to the whole world in the Millennium, if the strong arm of the law does not crush them out, even as it did those first beginnings, on account of their freeloveism, and worse. St. Paul's words should be written in flaming characters over all the gates of Spiritism: *quæ in occulto fiunt ab ipsis, turpe est et dicere* (Eph. v. 12). What a strange complement and consummation this is of Christian morality!

Let no man quote the old adage, that "the best of things may be abused," in defence of the morality of Spiritism. Abuse is an impossibility here; immorality is intrinsic, inherent in Spiritism itself. By banishing God, and, consequently, religion, from its very teaching, it subverts all the foundations and safeguards of moral virtues. Instead of the religious worship of God, the Creator and Remunerator of man, the Spiritist embraces the grossest superstition, worshipping the spirits of dead men, more stupid or not wiser than himself. His exterior worship is brought down to the insipid mummery and experimenting of the séances; for his soul there is nothing left but the mockery of gibbering ghosts. Yet, all the while, his passions remain, and, as he flings the law of God behind his back, his low cravings possess him wholly. What can restrain him from abandoning himself to every vice? Shall it be the fear of God? He will not own such fear. Shall it be the fear of civil law? As he is a Spiritist, he is a Socialist. Shall it be a sense of decency? His definition of decency is to make the best of

the chances of this life without getting into trouble. Shall it be the ambition of rising to a higher station in Spiritland? There is no hurry; he is sure to rise, sooner or later, but, meantime, he will have his way. Surely the immorality which must be the necessary consequence of such belief can be easily understood by every man who knows his own heart. The *moral* claims and promises of Spiritism are intrinsically immoral in principle, and extrinsically lawless in practice.

With these anti-moral and anti-religious tendencies, it is easy to calculate the effect Spiritism might produce in the end upon the social condition of mankind. Suppose, for an instant, the universal adoption of Spiritism among the civilized nations. Religion is dead; morality a byword to scoff at its death; the *hereafter*, that terrible whip which formerly could keep even a coward to his track, will be only the invisible re-enacting of the present life, without a shadow of retribution; low in society here, a man will appear low there; high here, he must begin exalted there; hereafter is only another planetary existence, a little more ethereal than the present, but otherwise its perfect counterpart. How shall such doctrines and beliefs do away with the social evils? How can they do away with the insolence of office and the pride of life, the proud man's contumely and the oppressor's wrongs? How can they set bounds to the tyranny of wealth, or stay the lash that galls—not stubborn slaves—but people driven by laws and arms to starvation? How, above all, can it reconcile the discontented masses, and bring them to a patient frame of mind? For why should the high-bred or the base-born tyrant fear the assassin's blow, or the assassin dread the gallows, if death is only the transit to another stage where they must play the same role over again with the certainty of rising to the rank of *stars* at last? Thus Spiritism cuts all the nerves and ligaments of the social body to pieces. It openly advocates Socialism, and is straining forward with all its strength towards the dissolution of society into atoms, to individualism, which is never, and can never be, separated from Servilism and Despotism. Without God, without religious truths, without moral principles, it renders civil authority an impossibility unless it be armed with pagan omnipotence and absolutism. Adopting, with an Eclecticism and Syncretism worse than pagan, not the truths and virtues, but the worst errors and vices of mankind, Spiritism is ultra-radical, toiling to pull down all existing institutions without building up anything save illusory hopes and frenzies. While preaching Optimism, it works Pessimism; while promising to resuscitate man from the deadly errors of the past, it is hurling him back into them. Spiritism can only paganize the individual, the family, and the state, and if anybody wishes to un-

derstand in full what that means, let him read Mr. Allies's *Formation of Christendom.*

Such are the claims and promises of Spiritism for the welfare of the individual, the family, and the state, to be realized in the millennium.

Of all the fair promises of Spiritism to satisfy the hearts of men, only its boast of scientific revelations now remains, and that is, after all the voluminous communications of the spirits, a sorry boast. That spirits of the 19th century should go to all this trouble in order to tell us of an unknown God, of pre-existing souls, of their transmigration, and all the other philosophical falsehoods that the world has been smiling at in the vagaries of the old pagans, can only excite one's pity.[1] Science has gained nothing new from these revelations, has certainly not learned anything reliable. The whole chaos of Spiritism has contributed only one scientific blessing, and that is a palpable proof that ancient and modern magic is not a mere trickery and an ungrounded superstition, but the dark work of evil spirits.[2] Even this is not a discovery; the old fact so well known to our forefathers has merely received the nod of skeptical science to allow it to exist. Every other revelation, even that of the immortality of the soul, possesses no higher scientific value than can attach to the assertions of spirits that are chronic liars.

Dr. Wieser is inclined to grant a little more. He says (l. c., p. 681), that the mediumistic force that has been evolved by the practices of Spiritism postulates the admission of a hitherto *unexplored natural force* in man, and assigns the following reasons: 1. The "mediumistic endowment," which is required for the achievement of certain results, is connected not so much with the moral as with the physical qualities of the medium, and is gradually developed and perfected by practice. 2. The closing of the chain, that is, the

---

[1] Here is Mr. Huxley's appreciation of the revelations of the spirits, of which he delivered himself in his speech to the Committee of the Dialectical Society of London: "But supposing the phenomena to be genuine, they do not interest me. If anybody would endow me with the faculty of listening to the chatter of old women and curates at the nearest cathedral town, I should decline the privilege, having better things to do. And if the folk in the spirit world do not talk more wisely and sensibly than their friends report them to do, I put them in the same category."

[2] In this connection the learned Dr. Wieser has a pertinent note on the vexed question of witchcraft. He writes: "Witchcraft is at bottom identical with Spiritism; it only developed itself in a different direction. Who will persuade himself that this plant, which flourishes and spreads out its branches so luxuriantly in our sober century, did not find a congenial soil when alchemy and astrology were in full bloom? We do not deny the enormous abuses of the witchcraft processes; but that everything was only an airy nothing, cannot possibly be admitted. The *onus* of the abuses falls especially upon jurists; the Holy See can least of all be held accountable for them." L. c., p. 132.

locking of hands, is, as a rule, required as a preparation and a support of that force, in order to evoke and sustain its activity. 3. If the phenomena were produced in the presence merely of the medium, it would be impossible to assign a reason for the excessive nervous strain and subsequent exhaustion to which the medium is invariably subjected, as also for the fact that any, even an accidental, breaking of the chain by the withdrawing of a hand instantly disturbs or entirely breaks off the phenomena.

This, we submit, is granting too much. If the mediumistic endowment is a natural and a physical force, it is difficult to understand why it should be given to only a few individuals, and above all why it should be limited to one or other class of phenomena, and not embrace all of them. But, apart from these considerations, there is no need of admitting an unexplored physical force at all. Dr. Wieser more than once maintains, and that correctly, that the physical condition of an active medium is merely a case of *transient possession*. This explains everything. Surely, possession does not require a *special* physical aptitude, or a yet unexplored force in man. With God's permission the devil can take possession of any man's body, and can lay hold of it under such conditions and in such a manner as he thinks expedient, or as God compels him. This is the obvious explanation of the mediumistic force. The spirits choose a medium, heighten its nervous powers, and work their marvels. The external condition *sine quà non* points to nothing new in the medium. It is well known to those who have given the history of ancient and modern magic some attention, that the evil spirits are always bound down to certain conditions in their communications with men. The Almighty has subjected them to this ignominious servility, not only for their own humiliation, but also for the conviction of guilty man, who cannot, after such conditions, plead ignorance for his dealings with the enemies of God. The closing of the chain is certainly only a condition for entering into dealings with the spirits, and the disastrous consequences of mediumistic activity differ in nothing from those of ordinary possession.

Many will be reminded by the foregoing remarks of those hideous spectacles which Spiritist eulogists only hint at in their books, and of which Dr. Larkin's servant girl, Mary Jane, may be taken as a fair illustration. We are told that in the mediumistic state she was thrown down, her limbs were dislocated, she foamed at the mouth, cried out, swore and blasphemed with loud bursts of laughter and ribald scoffing. To the Christian mind this is unquestionably *possession*, and if the devil treats other mediums more gently, it will be remembered that even the devil can be civil when it serves his purpose. And here a suggestion to honest Spiritists

like Mr. Wallace will not be out of place. They have subjected the phenomena of Spiritism to all the tests within their reach except one, namely, the power of exorcism as practiced by the Catholic Church. It would certainly be a new departure to call in a Catholic priest to exorcise an operating medium, and the result might lead many Spiritists to a higher field of investigation to which they have hitherto given no thought.

When asked why the spirits have not made at least one important scientific revelation as to the mysteries of nature around us, Zoellner answers that it is owing "to our incapability of understanding them," and Ulrici adds that "the spirits know very well that men can learn the secrets of nature *only by experience*, and must freely, that is, by their own endeavors, seek and find the vital moral and religious truths," and he solemnly concludes, "the hand of Providence directs those spirits, and rules their contact with our lives." Sweet Providence! We know so much, or rather so little about nature, that we could not understand more! But why do not the spirits teach us at least the history of the past, give us the *facts*. The spirits ought at least to remember their own lives. Why then not conjure up the ghosts of the great actors themselves to give the true version of their deeds? Why not summon Napoleon to furnish the lost sequel of the Memoirs of Madame de Rémusat? Alas, we could not understand! Therefore, instead of substantial information, our disembodied friends can only give us philosophical nonsense, disjointed romances, newspaper poetry, and sentiment. These goblins have indeed a holy reverence for our unfortunate condition,—a high motive to leave us in it, because we cannot understand! Otherwise interminably loquacious, they answer our most eager and importunate pleadings for scientific enlightenment with pitying silence; for we are blockheads, and must work out our destiny on the hard road of experience. Yet this is the claim and promise of scientific progress.

The irreligion, immorality, socialism, absolutism, nihilism, and despair, into which Spiritism is striving to hurl mankind by its demon worship, prove conclusively, if proof were at all needed, that its whole *mission* is in its origin, its spirit, its tendency, and its effects Satanic. Spiritism is the work of Satan; but its providential purposes lie beyond his control in the hands of God. There is no need of further demonstration to show that Spiritism is in its very nature one of the most dangerous enemies of the Church. In its attack upon miracles as a criterion of revelation, and upon the faith and the principle of authority of the Church, it has used the most powerful engines that hell could devise, and worked them in the most effective manner. So far, however, from weakening the hold of Christian doctrines upon the minds of the children of the

Church, Spiritism has in many ways strengthened it. Spiritism has furnished a positive and palpable proof of the Christian teaching concerning evil spirits, thus justifying the exorcisms, benedictions, sacramentals, and ecclesiastical statutes against the practices of magic, over which even some of her sons shook their heads as if they were too much to accept. In the next place, the pseudo-revelation and pseudo-marvels of Spiritism have by contrast thrown Christian revelation and miracles into the strongest relief, making it next to impossible for men to deny their divine character. Neither has God been slow in manifesting His miraculous power to neutralize the baneful influence of the multitudinous portents of Spiritism. Over against the experimental, capricious, and ignoble communications with evil spirits, He raised up from the beginning of the present century saints for whom it seemed to be more natural to live in the sublimest intercourse with the angels and saints of heaven than with their friends and relatives upon earth. Before Spiritism ever made its appearance, the world had been awe-struck by the uninterrupted wonders in the life of Anne Catherine Emerich. Then came Maria Taigi and Louise Lateau, both of them divine condemnations of the trances and visions of Spiritists, while, against the other wholesale marvels of Satan, Lourdes alone filled the earth with miracles.

The complete failure of the attacks of Spiritism upon the Church prove once again that every attempt to equal or surpass her only confirms the historical fact that such endeavors are vain, and that the principles of her pure Christianity cannot be explained in any way on merely natural grounds. Surely, if any explanation ever promised to be satisfactory, it was that of modern Spiritism. On the other hand, Spiritism demonstrates that every departure from Christianity is only a falling back into paganism, that there can be for man only Christianity or heathenism, and that to heathenize Christianity is an impossibility. Spiritism is not only a relapse into paganism, but a plunge into the lowest depths of demon-worship.

In fine, Spiritism is shedding a strong light upon the Scriptural prophecy of Antichrist, enabling the incredulous to begin to believe St. Paul's announcement of "the man of sin," who, with the help of Satan, will arise with great signs and wonders, and claim for himself divine honors. A mere glance at modern Spiritism is sufficient to satisfy us that "the mystery of iniquity" is becoming ever more and more prominent, that anti Christianity, which will culminate in Antichrist, is constantly revealing more unmistakably its Satanic nature. Spiritism now needs but to enlist freemasonry in its ranks, as Dr. Wieser remarks, in order to array the powers of hell and the world in the most universal and terrible persecution against the Church that could be imagined. "But of

that day and hour no one knoweth," and the end may be far off yet. He who has directed Spiritism to break the pride of Materialism, and to give glory to his militant Church, may make the evil spirits of the séances, even as he made Balaam, the son of Beor, utter words of blessing instead of a curse. Or, He may allow ungrateful nations to become the guilty victims of Spiritist demon-worship, and while the Church springs again from the ashes of her ruins in Asia and Africa, suffer the western world to go on its way of paganism. But even then the end may not be as yet, and the day of salvation may dawn again. One saint of God could come and, singlehanded, overthrow the empire of Spiritism. That happened before, and may happen again. In the sixteenth century the East was buried in the darkness of Spiritism; fakirs, sanyasses, nirvanys, and jogys ruled with absolute power over that vast empire of Satan. One man went forth, commissioned by the Pope, and armed by God with the plenitude of miraculous power, and overthrew that vast empire of Satan. That man was the Jesuit missionary, St. Francis Xavier.

BOOK NOTICES.

THE WORKS OF ORESTES A. BROWNSON: Collected and arranged by *Henry F. Brownson*. Volume I. Containing the First Part of the Philosophical Writings. Detroit: Thorndike Nourse, publisher. 1882.

It was a very happy idea, on the part of his son, to collect, arrange, and republish the works of the late Dr. Orestes A. Brownson, in a series of consecutive volumes, the first of which lies before us; for, to use a somewhat hackneyed, yet, in this instance, a perfectly true and expressive phrase, the collection and republication of these works will supply a widely and deeply felt want. The writings of Dr. Brownson were scattered, in great degree, through quarterly reviews, monthly magazines, and weekly newspapers. Owing to this it is a work of extreme difficulty to make a collection of his writings. It was very difficult even to obtain a full set of Brownson's *Quarterly Review*, which contained many of his most important essays, and, with the exception of a few occasional articles, was written entirely by himself.

Yet the placing of his works within reach of the public, by a republication of them, was greatly to be desired; for Dr. Brownson was, beyond all question, the keenest dialectician America has produced, and, after his conversion to the true faith, the ablest Catholic lay controversialist whom God has thus far raised up and called into His service in America. Indeed, it may be questioned whether, as a philosophical critic, his peer could be found in Europe. His power of analysis was wonderful. He seemed instinctively to perceive the fundamental fallacy of the erroneous systems he discussed, and with a criticism which was as keen as it was severely logical, he dragged the falsehood to light, stripped it of its disguises, separated from it the truths with which it sought to connect itself, and exposed plainly to view the delusive arguments. He had the rare gift of being at once profound and clear. His arrangement of ideas was so direct and consecutive, his language so lucid and so strong, that minds which would have been unable to understand his arguments if presented by other writers, readily followed and understood him, even when discussing subjects too profound for ordinary comprehension. On this point it seems eminently proper to republish what was said in the AMERICAN CATHOLIC QUARTERLY REVIEW in the memorial notice of Dr. Brownson, in the July number of 1876: "... His *Review* is a rich mine, which will never lose its value for the student of controversial theology, of Christian philosophy, and Christian politics. His style, based on the best English models, gives an additional charm to all he wrote. He stands out, certainly unsurpassed, perhaps unequalled, by any of our countrymen, in his masterly handling of the mother-tongue. But the beautiful workmanship is as nothing compared to the glorious material which it adorns. It is like the mantle of gold which enwrapped the matchless Olympian Jove of Phidias. His logical power is simply wonderful; no sophistry, no specious reasoning of error or unbelief can stand before it. And, coupled with this, is the gift, so rare amongst profound thinkers and subtle dialecticians, of bringing home his triumphant process of reasoning to the minds even of ordinary readers with clearness and precision."

Though Dr. Brownson always dealt with living questions of his time, and though he has passed away, yet most of the subjects on which he wrote retain their freshness as being immediately connected with ques-

tions which still survive, and which are of permanent and paramount importance. Others of those subjects, but the fewer of them, though less closely connected, in form, with present issues, yet have a real and vital relation to them; and will be read, not only with interest, but also with profit and instruction by the intelligent and thoughtful student of the underlying principles of the controversies of to-day. For Dr. Brownson, whether dealing with the profoundest questions of speculative philosophy, or with subjects of a purely practical character, always searched for, and, with a keenness of perception that seemed natural instinct or intuition, laid hold of and profoundly discussed the fundamental principles of the subjects he dealt with. He seized, with a tenacity that never lost its grasp, the deepest central idea of his subject, and on that he built his argument.

Hence the thoughtful student of politics, we mean of the methods and science of civil government, of philosophy and ethics (as well in their principles, as in the application of those principles) and of theology, will find in Brownson's writings, both a profitable intellectual exercise and a rich mine of instruction.

All, even, of his earliest essays, when he was farthest away from the truths of Christianity and of Christian politics and theology, can be perused and studied with profit, by the discriminating reader. For, though often widely astray in those earlier essays in the ideas which he positively puts forth, yet he was rarely, if ever, inaccurate in his dissection of the erroneous systems and methods he opposes. In his critical analysis of their fundamental thoughts and principles, and from the premises he lays down, true or false, his argument is conducted onwards with almost unerring precision.

As regards this, we again quote from the memorial notice of the American Catholic Quarterly Review:

"One need not subscribe to his philosophical system to recognize the power and skill that characterize his grappling with the most abstruse and intricate problems of metaphysics. And even those who do not assent to all his philosophical and political views, must allow that they were as conscientiously held as they were ably defended. Here, too, his great love of truth was manifest; for he retracted without shame or hesitation whatever he afterwards discovered to be false or unsound. Even when he laid down certain doctrines or opinions that gave offence and exposed him to obloquy and in some degree to persecution from his brethren in the faith, his fault, if such it must be called, arose both from his own brightness of intellect and his inherent love of truth. What he said he had to utter, because he saw it in the clearest light of evidence; and because it was unpopular, he feared that to give it anything short of the boldest expression might seem like paltering with the truth."

The editor has very properly prefixed to the first volume of his collection of Dr. Brownson's works an introduction, whose only fault is its brevity. It explains the logical process through which Dr. Brownson passed till he found firm ground, on which he could rest, and shows that his successive changes of opinion were not by any means the vagaries of a restless searcher after novelties, but the earnest strivings of a highly-gifted and earnest mind to attain the truth. Those changes were but the successive abandonment of errors, which, in course of time, he came to perceive, and the seizing hold of new truths; they were but the tentative efforts of one who ardently loved truth, and sincerely desired to know and embrace it. Hence, even the earlier writings of Dr. Brownson, though containing many ideas, which subse-

quently he discarded and refuted, are interesting and instructive, as showing how a strong and earnest mind, when in error, will strive to break its chains and reach the light and freedom of truth. And numerous as were the ideas and systems taken up by Dr. Brownson and each in turn discarded in his tentative process, and numerous as were his resulting changes of opinion, the connection between them is obvious; and the process through which he passed till he found rest, where true rest alone can be found, in the Catholic faith, is simple, direct, and easily understood. In youth, he was trained up in Calvinism; but reflection speedily caused him to revolt from its cold and cruel and illogical creed. He saw then that either he must "accept revealed authority, which would lead to the Catholic Church," or else "reject supernatural revelation, and seek for the truth in infidelity." With the ideas of Catholicity which he imbibed in his early training, he did not consider the first of these alternatives as worthy even of thought, and, therefore, adopting the second, he tried infidelity, chiefly under the forms of Universalism and Unitarianism. "For twenty years he wrote and preached the religion of humanity, philanthropy, and progress." Its ideas he earnestly tested and tried, but found that the progress and perfection of the race, of which he dreamed, required other light and aid than the race itself furnished. As he expressed it, "a man cannot raise himself by his own waistbands," and so neither could the human race, by its own efforts alone, rise above its natural condition. Some extrinsic aid and light, something outside of and above nature, must be communicated to it to elevate, perfect, and enlighten it. This something he could find nowhere, except in the supernatural life and divine doctrine of the Catholic Church. . . . "Dr. Brownson had already convinced himself of the insufficiency of Naturalism, Rationalism, and Transcendentalism; he had also convinced himself of the necessity of a divine revelation, and of the fact that the Christian revelation was such a revelation. From this, by a process of reasoning which may be seen in the article, *The Church against No Church*, he arrived infallibly at the Catholic Church." The process is simple and easy. It requires no metaphysical subtlety, no long chain of metaphysical reasoning. All it needs is good common sense, a reverent spirit, and a disposition to believe on sufficient evidence.

This was the process by which Dr. Brownson, "after twenty years and more of wandering, in search of a new and better way to the truth, was forced to come back to sit in humble docility at the feet of God's priests, and learn of those sent by our Lord to teach."

The following statements of the editor explain his method of arranging Dr. Brownson's writings, and his reasons for departing from an exact chronological order:

"It has been thought necessary for the full understanding of Dr. Brownson's philosophical writings to republish his earlier essays; but this has been done more for the purpose of showing how he arrived at his later conclusions and in what sense he understood them, than on account of any merit they have in themselves; for he himself expressly repudiates all his philosophical writings prior to his conversion. Still, while he disavowed these earlier writings, there was no time when he broke entirely away from them and started anew. In all his philosophical essays there is a slow and gradual elimination of previous erroneous thought and expression, and a clearer perception of the truth, growing brighter and brighter until in his *Essay in Refutation of Atheism* and the subsequent articles there is no longer any hesitancy or doubt, but he writes as one who has found the truth he has been seeking for all

his life long, and knows he has found it. Many, too, of the fundamental doctrines of his philosophy are more elaborately argued in the earlier essays than in the later writings; for in these he often assumes them as proved or adduces the principles on which their demonstration depends without digressing from the matter of which he is more especially treating.

"To place the philosophical writings at the commencement of these volumes may be a great obstacle in the way of some readers, who may be repelled by the dryness of the subject. But it is the logical order, and though the author's philosophy is drawn from revelation or tradition as well as from reason, a full understanding of it is useful, if not necessary, for the complete appreciation of his controversial writings. If accepted, it is a more convincing refutation of the errors of the day than the arguments aimed directly at them; for in all these arguments it enters as an important element, and besides the ground has shifted and is shifting daily."

Dr. Brownson's philosophico-political writings are highly worthy of study. They touch, "as with the point of a needle," the dominant political errors of our times. He held and forcibly shows that no government, democratic, aristocratic, or monarchical, is or can be a good government if divorced from religion, and moving on independently of the Church; and that no secular order can sustain itself without the aid of the Church, nor even with her aid, if Catholics adopt the false maxim that their politics have nothing to do with their religion, or in politics act as if God had no rights and they no religion; that God is King of kings and Lord of lords, and the state, whatever its constitution, is subject to His supreme and universal law, and bound by His law as declared by His Church, as much as is the individual himself. Dr. Brownson, accordingly, held that it is the forgetting of these great truths or the neglect of courtly prelates to insist on them with due emphasis that has brought the old Catholic nations of Europe into their present deplorable condition; and that without a recognition of these truths by the American people, American democracy will go to destruction.

Dr. Brownson also strenuously maintained the supremacy of the Pope as representative of the spiritual order over temporal princes; that the power assumed by the Pope to depose emperors and other princes during the Middle Ages belonged to him, *jure divino* and not simply *jure humano*, not from the *jus publicum*, or consent of the nations, but as the Vicar of Christ and as inherent in himself as the divinely constituted representative of the spiritual order on earth or in human affairs. But the Pope, as Dr. Brownson maintained, is not obliged to exercise this power unless he believed it necessary for the interest of religion, or to maintain freedom of conscience, and also believed that his sentence would be carried into effect. The Pope still holds the power, but there are no subjects on whom to exercise it. The Popes might as well have attempted to exercise it on the pagan emperors of Rome who persecuted the Christians of the Empire as to attempt to exercise it on any of the sovereigns of the present day, for they have all emancipated themselves from the law of God.

Consistently with this, Dr. Brownson maintained that it is impossible to protect society from secularism and godlessness without asserting the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal, or, in other words, of the law of God, when human laws conflict with it; that Gallicanism, which asserts the independence of the secular order, is a species of political atheism, and contains the germ of communism or socialism; and that we cannot find any practical safeguard against political atheism, the

error that is ruining modern society, except in the recognition of the supremacy of the spiritual order, and consequently of the Pope as its divinely instituted representative.

In one respect Dr. Brownson agreed with Liberal Catholics. He looked upon the restoration of the old, mediæval, Christendom as neither practicable nor desirable. There was much in that Christendom, which has passed away and which many confounded with the Church, that was not at all as the Church wished. The Church then, as now, had to maintain an unceasing conflict with the powers of this world. Secular rulers then, as now, sought to destroy her independence, subject her to their will, and deprive her of her rights as the Kingdom of God. Many of the Popes then had no easier time than had the late Pius IX., nor less formidable enemies of the Church to contend with, than Victor Emmanuel, Bismarck, and the revolution which they inaugurated, have proved to be. The Church can hardly suffer more from the internationalists, socialists, and communists of our own day than she has in the past from the kings and kaisers of the West and from the Emperors of the East.

The Christendom that has passed away was based on the monarchical principle, and the Church, to a great extent, held her relations with the faithful in each kingdom through its secular ruler, instead of through her own prelates, with whom, latterly at least, the Pope could communicate, and who could communicate with him only by permission of the king. In France, Spain, Austria, and Italy, the Church, under the monarchy that succeeded to feudalism, has been bound, hand and foot, by the secular powers, and it is *to this fact* we owe the dissolution of Christendom, the present condition of the Church in those nations, and the anti-Christian revolution now everywhere in progress. Had the Church been free, that revolution, it is not too much to say, would, humanly speaking, never have occurred. The secular sovereigns have, in great degree, alienated the affections of their subjects from the Church, and brought her into contempt with the people. To retain their crowns, they are now obliged, or believe themselves to be obliged, to support the revolution in its war against the Church. But in doing this, they are depriving themselves of all power to suppress the revolution which, after using them to humiliate and, were it possible, to enslave or destroy the Church, will cast them away.

The Liberal Catholics urge the Church to abandon the secular rulers who have abandoned her; to make peace with the revolution, give it her blessing, and labor to reconstruct Christendom on a popular basis. These are opposed by another party of Catholics, who think that it is necessary to reconstitute Christendom on its old monarchical and aristocratic basis.

With each of these parties, Dr. Brownson agreed in part, and to each of them he was also in part opposed. For the re-establishing of order, and the independence of the Church, he strove with heart and soul. He abhorred any alliance with the revolution, and any concession to it. But he could see no reason, supposing the people Catholic, why the Church cannot be as free and independent with Christendom based on the republican principle, as she ever was under the Christendom which has been dissolved. The Church is no more necessitated to ally herself with monarchy and nobility than with republicanism. She cannot make common cause with modern Liberalism, nor bless the atheistic revolution; but there is nothing in her doctrine or constitution that prevents her from accepting a republican Christendom, or giving her blessing to a Christian republic when once it is constituted. The

people are not less trustworthy than are kings and kaisers, and it was with the secular rulers, not with the people, it must be remembered, that the revolution originated.

This is a sufficient explanation, and refutation also, it seems to us, of the charge of *Liberalism* that was brought against Dr. Brownson previous to the suspension of his *Review*, in 1864. Though the Council of the Vatican had not yet been convoked he steadily maintained two essential points that were finally settled by that Council,—the supremacy of the Pope as the visible head of the Church, and his infallibility in teaching and determining all questions pertaining to faith. In his *Review*, he steadily contended that Our Lord founded the Church on Peter, and that the papacy is at the base as well as at the summit, the foundation as well as the crown of the edifice; that all power and authority in the Church is derived from Christ through him, and that bishops hold and exercise their authority in their respective jurisdictions, from him as the successor of Peter, and Vicar of Christ. Dr. Brownson, of course, previous to the Vatican Council, could not assert papal infallibility as a Catholic dogma, but he personally held it as true, and was never able to defend the infallibility of the Church to his own satisfaction, without asserting it. And when the Vatican Council defined and promulgated it, he hailed it with joy.

It remains for us briefly to notice the volume of his writings before us, the first of the republication of his complete works, by his son, Henry F. Brownson, Esq. This volume, in addition to the valuable introduction, from which we have drawn copiously in the foregoing remarks, is composed of articles in which fundamental questions of metaphysics and philosophy are discussed with the keen analysis and depth of thought which so eminently characterize Dr. Brownson's writings. The titles of these articles are, respectively: "Philosophy and Common Sense;" "Schmucker's Psychology;" "Synthetic Philosophy;" "Kant's Critic of Pure Reason" (three articles); "An a priori Autobiography;" "The Existence of God;" "Schools of Philosophy;" "What Human Reason Can Do;" "Gratry on the Knowledge of God" (two articles); "Gratry's Logic;" "The Problem of Causality;" "Primitive Elements of Thought;" "Maret on Reason and Revelation" (two articles); "Rationalism and Traditionalism."

It would extend this notice, which already much exceeds the original intention of its writer, too far, to attempt, even briefly, to summarize the ideas set forth by Dr. Brownson in these articles. Suffice it to say that, while readers may differ with him on various points, as they do and will with each other, yet no one can read these essays thoughtfully without great intellectual benefit, and at the same time with interest; not only as acute and profound disquisitions on important subjects, but also as the expressions of a powerful and thoroughly earnest mind striving to grasp the truth in its relations to some of the profoundest questions which tax the powers of the human intellect.

THE BEGINNINGS OF HISTORY: According to the Bible and the Traditions of Oriental Peoples. From the Creation of Man to the Deluge. By *François Lenormant*, Professor of Archæology at the National Library of France, etc. (Translated from the Second French Edition.) With an Introduction by *Francis Brown*, Associate Professor in Biblical Philology, Union Theological Seminary. 1 vol., 12mo., 640 pp. $2.50.

The subject of this book, as well as the high reputation and well-known scholarship of its distinguished author, and the spirit of good faith in which it is written, render it one of the most valuable contributions of

modern inquiry to the important work of harmonizing science and religion.

Mr. Lenormant begins his book by inscribing at the head of it that sentence of Montaigne: "C'est icy, lecteurs, un livre de bonne foy," —"this is, oh readers, a book written in good faith,"—and by proclaiming in the preface that he is a Christian, that he acknowledges one science only, that his faith rests upon too solid a foundation to be timid, that he believes firmly in the inspiration of the sacred books, and that he subscribes with absolute submission to the doctrinal decisions of the Church.

The wonderful discoveries of the last fifty years in the vast field of Egyptian and Assyrian archæologies having changed entirely the face of history, as far as the early periods of mankind are concerned, far from resulting, however, in opposition to the Holy Scriptures, the more they are discussed the more they prove to be in confirmation of its statements. As remarked by the editor of the great work of George Smith,[1] "the earlier chapters of *Genesis* no longer stood alone." The clay records of ancient Babylonia, as well as the stone monuments of other nations, the writings of early poets and lawgivers, and the legends and traditions handed down from generation to generation since the most ancient times, all prove to be united together to demonstrate that even in history "a little philosophy inclineth man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds back to religion."

The attempt has been often made to put in contradiction revelation and science. The boldest think that science, being *positive*, and supported by facts, must prevail upon faith. Others, more timid, while consenting, either by admission, or by silence, that there is genuine conflict between the one and the other, maintain, however, that they constitute two fields of exploration entirely different, and that to each one of them belongs a peculiar kind of truth which cannot be reached in another way.

We believe that truth is one and always the same, and that its light has to be seen, from whatever place we look at it. We cannot conceive a fact which according to science is false, and is true according to revelation. But we give preference to the divine instruction, and, if it happens that the circumstances are such as to render reconciliation impossible, we would not hesitate to decide for a suspension of judgment, being certain beforehand that new discoveries, new facts, and further elucidation of the matter will succeed in the end in securing harmony and reaffirming the Word of God.

Geology used to be, in the beginning of this century, and in the hands of the disciples of Voltaire and Diderot, a well-provided arsenal, from which to draw arguments against the cosmogony of the Bible. But when the powerful voice of such a man as Cardinal Wiseman was heard in connection with this subject,[2] all fears were dispelled, and the rights of truth were vindicated. Further investigation demonstrated that even such details as the ones connected with the miserable condition of life to which man was submitted subsequent to his expulsion from Paradise, can be found out and read with peculiar emphasis upon the crust of our globe.

The chronology of the Bible was, likewise, one of the greatest battle-fields for infidels and opponents of revelation. The structure of the

[1] The Chaldean Account of Genesis, by George Smith. London, 1880.

[2] Twelve Lectures on the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion. London, 1835.

earth itself proves *beyond doubt*, they say, that from the advent of man up to this date thousands and thousands of years should have intervened. But the extravagant speculations in which they have indulged upon this matter have fallen to the ground under the authority of Cuvier, when he declared "that, if there is anything well proved in geology, it is the fact that the surface of our globe experienced a sudden and complete revolution, the date of which cannot possibly be assigned farther back than five or six thousand years before the present age; that that revolution consisted of a flood, which inundated the whole land inhabited by men and by the species of animals which are best known to-day; that the bottom of what theretofore had been the sea became thereafter dry land,[1] and formed the portion of the globe which is now inhabited; and that subsequent to this cataclysm a small number of individuals, who escaped from it, scattered themselves in all directions, propagated and multiplied themselves, founded the beginnings of society, built cities and palaces, and commenced to collect natural facts, and combine upon them scientific systems."[2]

Some learned men, thoroughly conversant, as they ought to be, with Egyptian antiquities, having found two zodiacs, the one sculptured upon the ceiling of the Temple of Dendera, and the other upon that of the Temple at Esneh, in Upper Egypt, set themselves to work, and proclaimed to the world that the Scriptural chronology has been completely exploded. Their astronomical calculations, *exact* as everything which has a mathematical character, *proved* that one of the two zodiacs was 3000 years old when the Christian era was commenced, and that the other "could be no younger than 17,000 years." Unfortunately for them, the great Champollion, adding to the patience and indefatigable activity of the scholar that lack of arrogance and pride which is the characteristic of real learning, found the name of *Augustus Cæsar* upon the zodiac of Dendera, and the name of *Antoninus* upon the one at Esneh.

Coming now to the book which is the subject of these remarks, we find that its purpose is to demonstrate that what is said in the first chapters of *Genesis* is the expression of "the ancient Hebrew traditions of the beginnings of things, which the Hebrews held in common with the nations by whom they were surrounded, and in a very special way with the Chaldæo-Babylonians." "This compilation," says the author, "was made by an inspired writer, who found means, while collating the old narratives, to make them the figurative garb of eternal truths, such as the creation of the world by a personal God, the descent of mankind from a single pair, their fall in consequence of the guilt of the first parents, which put them under the dominion of sin, and the free-will character of the first sin and of those which followed in its train."

Acting upon this principle, the author considers, in succession, "the creation of man," "the first sin," "the cherubim and the revolving sword," "the fratricide and the foundation of the first city," "the Shethites and the Cainites," "the ten antediluvian Patriarchs," "the children of God and the daughters of men," and "the deluge."

In corroboration of the Biblical account about the creation of man, Mr. Lenormant explains, with immense erudition and great lucidity, the Phœnician ideas, such as have been transmitted to us by Sanchoniathon, and points at their first human and mortal pair, Protogonos and Aeon,

[1] It is well known that what constitutes to-day the Great Sahara was a vast Mediterranean Sea; and this fact and the traditions, recorded by Plato and others, about Atlantis, or the Atlantis Island, situated somewhere between Spain and Africa, now buried out of sight, are curious monuments of this catastrophe.

[2] Cuvier, Discours sur les Revolutions de la Surface du Globe, etc. Paris, 1830.

calling attention to the fact that "Protogonos" in Greek, as well as "Adam-Cadmuth" in Hebrew, means "first-born." He reviews the traditions of Libya and the Egyptians' ideas that the mud, left by the Nile, and exposed to the vivifying action of the Sun-God, brought forth germs which sprang up as the bodies of men. He shows to us the monuments of Egypt, where it appears that man was made by the Divinity, by moulding clay upon the same potter's wheel on which the primordial egg of the universe had been already shaped. He explains, with remarkable learning, the traditions of the Chaldeans upon this subject, and shows us the striking resemblance between the account given by Berossus and the statements of *Genesis*. Belos, seeing that the earth was uninhabited, although fertile, took clay, and kneaded it with his own blood, and formed men, who were endowed with intelligence and shared in the divine thought, but were in common with the animals in all other respects.

The clay tablets, covered with cuneiform writing, belonging to the palace library of Nineveh, now in the British Museum, which contain the history of the creation,—and to which a great portion of the book of George Smith, above quoted, is devoted,—as well as the writings of Zoroaster, the Greek traditions of Prometheus, the legends of Scandinavia and other nations, and even the cosmogonies of Peru, of the Mandan Indians, and of Tahiti, are considered *in extenso*, and called upon to confirm the Biblical narration. All this is done with considerable accuracy, and if the conclusions of the author are not always acceptable, the merit of his labors does not suffer by it. The value of the book, as remarked by Mr. Brown in his introduction, does not depend as much upon the correctness of this or that particular opinion maintained in it as upon the opportunities it affords of studying the matter, and form upon the materials it has furnished just opinions of our own.

Mr. Lenormant seems, for instance, to be inclined to the idea, set forth by Plato more fully than by others, that the first human being was created androgynous, that is, man and woman at the same time; that upon a second thought the Creator divided it into two and separated the two sexes, and that the attraction of the two halves seeking forever to be joined together again in a perfect union constitutes love.[1]

Our learned author finds this doctrine in the Jewish tradition, in the Targumim and the Talmud, as well as in the writings of learned philosophers like Moses, Maïmonides and others; and, showing a good deal both of philological knowledge and ingenuity, notices that Genesis in its first chapter reads that God created man, male and female; that in the second chapter it says that God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam; that He took then one of his ribs, and that the rib which was taken from man was made a woman; and that the Hebrew word translated into the English word *rib* means also *side*, and is used in this sense in several passages of the Bible. Upon these facts, and for some other reasons, supported always by good authority, the author seems to conclude that the androgyn theory is correct, and that during the stupor of Adam the Creator separated from him one side, the feminine part, in order to make of it a distinct person.

The way in which the author handles the matter of "the first sin" is exceedingly curious and interesting. His demonstration of the univer-

---

[1] Plato says: "The cause of the desire for so perfect a mingling with the beloved person, that the two may henceforth be one, arises from the fact that our primitive nature was one, and that we were beforetime an entirely perfect being. The desire for and the pursuit of this unity is called love."—*Bangret.*

sality of the belief in an age of happiness and innocence in the infancy of mankind, and in the degeneracy subsequent to it through the fault of man, seems to be conclusive. The limits of this article do not allow us to follow him step by step, and find with him almost always the same representations, the same symbols,—the garden, the tree, the serpent, the female curiosity, every one of the scriptural details, in a word, in the records and traditions of all the nations. "The analogy of form between the myths and the Bible narrative," says Mr. Lenormant, "is striking. It is, doubtless, the same tradition, but apprehended in quite another sense. The spirit of error among the Gentiles changed the mysterious symbolic reminder of the event which decided the condition of humanity. But the inspired author of Genesis adopted it under the very form which it had worn to the material sense, but he restored its true meaning and drew from it its solemn teaching."

One curious chapter of Mr. Lenormant's book is the one in which he engages in the investigation of the analogy between the Assyrian word *ki-ru-bu*, meaning the winged bulls which the Assyrians used to place at the gates of their palaces and dwelling-houses as protecting deities opposing the coming in of any evil, and the cherubim placed by God at the gates of paradise after the expulsion of Adam. The revolving sword is also studied in the same way.

The fratricide in connection with the building of Hanok, the first city, furnishes Mr. Lenormant ample material for exceedingly interesting remarks. The third month of the year in the Chaldæan calendar was named the month of brickmaking; this month was represented in the Chaldæan zodiac as well as in ours by the sign of Gemini, and the name "month of the twins" is also found in some cases instead of the one of "month of brickmaking," as above stated. The author sees that the Bible associates the building of the first city with the first murder perpetrated by one brother upon another, and then he says: "This tradition, which associates the formation of a city with a fratricide is, in fact, one of the ideas common to most nations of strictly primitive origin, anterior to the dispersion of the great civilized races, and may be traced almost everywhere. It would be a curious study to follow it through all its variations, beginning with Cain, who built the first city, Hanock, after slaying Abel, and ending with Romulus, who laid the foundation of Rome in the blood of his brother Remus."

It was well known, thanks to the labors of George Smith, Wilkinson, the two Rawlinsons, and others, that the Biblical account of the ten antediluvian patriarchs is corroborated by an imposing array of concordant testimony gathered from Egyptian and Babylonian sources. But Mr. Lenormant, going farther, has found out the same tradition almost everywhere in the world, and gives a synopsis of his inquiries, which cannot but be read with admiration. "These patriarchs," he says, "are ten in the story of Genesis; and, with a strange persistence, this number ten is reproduced in the legends of a very great number of nations when dealing with their primitive ancestors, yet shrouded in the mist of fable. To whatever epoch they trace back their ancestors, whether before or after the deluge, whether the mythic or the historic side predominates in their physiognomy, they invariably offer this sacramental number ten."

The names of the ten antediluvian kings mentioned in the Chaldaic tradition have been transmitted by Berossus. The Assyrian tradition preserved by Abydenus places at the beginning of the nation, anteriorly to the foundation of Nineveh, ten generations of heroes. The Armenian legends give the names of ten ancestral heroes, preceding Aram,

who finally organized the nation. The cosmogonic legends of the Hindus show the succession of ten *Pitris*, or "fathers." The sacred books of the Iranians give account of nine successive heroes of an absolutely mythical character, who, if added to Gayomaretan, the typical man, make ten. The Chinese reckon ten emperors sharing in the divine nature between Fo-hi and the sovereign who inaugurated their historic age. Germans and Scandinavians believed in ten ancestors of Wodan or Odin. Arabian legends speak of the ten mythical kings of "Ad." And the gods who reigned in Egypt before Menes were also ten.

In connection with this, mention must be made of the belief common to all nations in an extreme longevity among the earliest ancestors of the human race; and also of the universal notion of the gigantic stature of primitive men, and of the sanctity of character of one of the ten original ancestors in contrast with the evils and the impiety which surrounded him. In the same way as is related in the Bible that Enoch, a holy man, did not die, but was translated to heaven, Xisuthrus, one of the five Chaldean kings, is also a type of goodness and ends in the same way.

The deluge, among all the traditions which concern the history of primitive humanity, seems to be the most universal and best established of all. The Chaldean account of the deluge, as translated from the cuneiform epic of Izdubar, had already been the subject of most important investigations. The agreement between this and the Biblical narrative as to the announcement of the catastrophe, the command to build the ark, what was to be taken into it, the size of the ark, its being coated with bitumen, the coming of the flood, the idea that it came in punishment of the sins of mankind, the destruction of the people, the duration of the deluge, the assuaging of the waters, the opening of the ark's window, the ark's resting on a mountain, the sending forth of a bird, the order to leave the ark, the building of an altar, the promise that a deluge would not happen again, the covenant, the rainbow as a pledge of the covenant, etc., etc., had been pointed out with considerable clearness by George Smith and the two Rawlinsons. But Mr. Lenormant has widened the field, and extended his inquiries almost to every quarter of the globe.

We cannot follow him through the more than one hundred pages which he devotes to this subject, but must content ourselves with commending this chapter, the last of the volume, to the attentive consideration of all readers.

As stated before, more than one of the conclusions of the author seem not to be acceptable, and there are some which may be deemed injudicious. He says, himself, that he expects numerous objections, and that he makes "no pretension to infallibility." He acknowledges that he has freely exercised his liberty as a scholar, and maintains that "his strict fidelity to Catholic orthodoxy does not interfere with his right to do so." But his book will be welcomed, and will be added to the list of those, not many indeed in number, which are of lasting value.

THE TYPHOONS OF THE CHINESE SEAS, IN THE YEAR 1881. By *Marc Dechevrens, S. J.*, Director of the Zi-Ka-Wei Observatory, China. Shanghai: Kelly & Walsh. 1882.

The position of the Catholic missionary in the great empire of China is far different from that of his brethren in other pagan countries. While these latter have to deal with nations still barbarous, he must

meet on their own ground a people who can boast of a civilization older than our own and who point with pride to a literature which had reached a high stage of perfection when Christianity was yet in its infancy. Thus the missionary finds that to gain this countless nation to the standard of Christ he must speak to their minds as well as to their hearts. Aware of these facts, the first missionaries after Saint Francis Xavier strove to win the people not less by their learning and science than by their preaching and virtue. Hence the efforts made by Ricci, Schall, Verbeist, and Gerbillon. These devoted men gained so completely the Emperor's favor by their scientific knowledge that, besides admitting them to the imperial palace, he bestowed on them the highest honors, and even consulted them on the most important and intricate questions. Their influence is manifested by the works which they published, as also by their labors in the great observatory of Peking, whose ruins, even at the present day testify to its former importance.

About a century ago the work of the missionaries was, in a great measure, checked by adverse circumstances, and by the imperial edicts against the Christian faith. Of late years, however, affairs have assumed a brighter aspect, and the severe measures formerly adopted have been somewhat relaxed. In general, all the missions are flourishing, and that of the Vicariate of Nanking can count 100,000 Christians earnest in their endeavors to imitate their illustrious ancestors. But, alas! this little band dwindles into insignificance when we reflect that this Vicariate alone contains 40,000,000 idolaters.

In addition to the many labors of this extensive mission, the Jesuit fathers have opened an industrial school, a college, and a seminary. They also publish a weekly paper in Chinese, and strive to promote the study of natural history. A meteorological observatory has lately been started, which is furnished with all the instruments necessary for that branch. The progress made in natural history is attested by the splendid works which the Fathers have published, among which special mention should be made of the "*Memoires concernant l' Histoire Naturelle de l' Empire Chinois*," and the famous book of Father Hende, entitled: "*Conchyliologie Fluviatile de la Province de Nanking et de la Chine Centrale.*"

Father Dechevrens, the present director of the observatory, has been untiring in his efforts to promote meteorological investigations, and his labors have attracted the attention, not only of the local authorities, but also of several eminent French and English scientists. The work abovementioned on the typhoons of the Chinese seas is one of his latest publications, the merit of which may be gathered from the following notice of it in *Nature*, a paper which certainly cannot be accused of partiality towards the Catholic Church.

"This work, by the learned director of the Zi-Ka-Wei Observatory, consisting of 171 pages quarto, and eight illustrative plates giving the tracks of the twenty typhoons of 1881, may be regarded as the outcome of the recent establishment of meteorological stations over the regions swept by the typhoon. The typhoons of 1880, amounting to fourteen, were described by Father Dechevrens in a previous paper. These two papers, from the greater fulness and accuracy of their details, form a contribution of considerable importance to the literature of cyclones.

"An examination of the tracks of these thirty-four typhoons shows that they generally have their origin in the zone comprised between the parallels of 10° and 17°, some of them originating in the Archipelago of the Philippines, but the greater number to the eastward of these islands in the Pacific. The first part of their course is westerly and northwesterly; they then recurve about the latitude of Shanghai, and

thence follow a northeasterly course over Japan. During the first half of their course the barometric gradients are steepest, and the destructive energy of typhoons is most fully developed; but after advancing on the continent, and particularly after recurving to eastward, they rapidly increase in extent, form gradients less steep, and ultimately assume the ordinary form of the cyclones of Northwestern Europe. In illustration of the steepness of the gradients sometimes formed, it is stated that on July 15 a gradient occurred of 2.760 inches per 100 miles, or one inch to 36 miles.

"Typhoons do not occur during the prevalence of the northeast monsoon, from November to May. In 1881 the typhoon season extended from May 22d to November 29th. In Japan the true typhoon season is restricted to August and September, the storms there during the other months resembling rather the ordinary cyclones of temperate regions. The tracks of the typhoons during the months of moderate temperature, May, June, the latter half of September, October and November, are the most southerly; they lie flattest on the parallels of latitude, and present a great concavity looking eastward; but those of the warmer months, July, August, and the beginning of September, exhibit, on the other hand, very open curves. This seasonal difference in the form of the tracks, taken in connection with the general form of the recurving tracks of the West Indian hurricanes, which are less open than those of the Chinese seas, suggests a possible connection between the forms of these curves and the different distributions of atmospheric pressure prevailing over the continents at the time.

"Of the new facts brought forward in this report, the most important, perhaps, are those which show that the typhoon tracks have the feature of recurvation as distinctly as the hurricanes of the West Indies and the Indian Ocean. The degree of recurvation and the relative frequency with which it occurs in the tracks of the cyclones of the Chinese seas, the West Indies, the Indian Ocean near Madagascar, and the Bay of Bengal respectively, are important features in the history of these storms, which such reports will do much to elucidate. We shall look forward with the liveliest interest to Father Dechevrens's future reports, which, from the lines of inquiry already indicated, may be expected to throw considerable light on the influence of extensive regions of dry air and of moist air respectively, and of elevated table-lands, in determining the continuance and the direction of the course of cyclones, and the influence of isolated mountains and mountainous ridges in breaking up a cyclone into two distinct cyclones, which, from the difficulty necessarily experienced by seamen in interpreting the complex phenomena attending them, often prove so destructive in their effects."

THE HOLY MAN OF TOURS; or, The Life of Leon Papin-Dupont, who died at Tours, in the Odor of Sanctity, March 18th, 1876. Translated from the French of M. L'Abbé Janvier, Priest of the Holy Face. With permission of the Author. Baltimore: Published by John Murphy & Co. 1882.

THE LIFE OF LEON PAPIN-DUPONT, THE HOLY MAN OF TOURS. London: Burns & Oates. Dublin: M. H. Gill & Sons. 1882.

These two works are on the same subject. The first, as stated on its title-page, is a translation of a revision and abridgment by the Abbé Janvier, in 1881, of his previous more voluminous biography of M. Leon Papin-Dupont, published in 1879. The second is an independent work of a writer in England, made up chiefly from Abbé Janvier's materials, and also using M. Leon Aubineau's reminiscences of the Holy Man of Tours.

Each of these works has its respective merits, and each of them clearly and distinctly portrays the saintly character and works of M. Papin-Dupont.

They are both interesting and edifying as showing how, in this secular materialistic age, when Catholic laymen, particularly those who are possessors of large inherited and acquired estates, are apt to imagine that there is no call to them to engage in special works of devotion and of charity, God raises up from among themselves instances of laymen, wealthy as themselves, who, though remaining in the world, yet throw off its spirit, and by their zeal, their devotion, their charity, prove that it is possible to live in the world, and yet not be of it, and serve as shining examples to their fellow-laymen. Such was M. Leon Papin-Dupont, the Holy Man of Tours.

He was born in the island of Guadaloupe, of French Catholic parents, of noble extraction. Deprived of his father by death when he was six years of age, his youthful education was conducted for awhile in Guadaloupe under the care of his widowed mother, who was a highly exemplary Christian lady. He was then sent to the United States, and two years afterwards to France, where he completed his education in the College of Pontleroy and the law schools of Paris. Naturally he was high-spirited, bold, and pertinacious in his purposes. He had brilliant talents, was witty, genial, generous, and of distinguished manners. Physically he was tall, handsome, and expert in athletic exercises. In his minority his annual allowance by his guardian was more than ample to meet all reasonable personal expenses and to allow him to indulge in fashionable amusements, and when he attained legal age he entered upon the possession of a large fortune.

Such was Leon Papin-Dupont, a youth in Paris, at twenty-one, free from all family control and fond of pleasure, admired and courted in the highest circles of fashionable society. For awhile he enjoyed with zest the amusements of the Parisian *beau monde*, and allowed himself to be engrossed with worldly frivolities. Yet, though his early piety suffered an eclipse at this time, and the affairs of his soul occupied but a slender portion of his attention, he did not actually renounce or discontinue the practice of his religion. He retained an unsullied reputation as regards morality, and his life, though worldly, was not corrupt. Moreover, his society was not limited to gay acquaintances of the fashionable world. He also cultivated acquaintances of a more profitable character, with men who were as remarkable for their talents as for their sound Christian principles. One of these who was a highly gifted and devoted young priest, who had been one of his schoolfellows, and exercised a salutary influence over him.

M. Dupont's conversion from a worldly life was effected by a seemingly trivial incident. From that time onwards, without secluding himself from the world, or taking any special religious vows, he devoted himself unsparingly to a life of prayer and charity and holy labors. What gives additional interest, too, to the recital of these labors and the beautiful portraiture of his character which the volumes before us contain, is the fact that M. Dupont belonged not to an age that has passed and gone, but to our own times, thus being a shining proof that the power to excite her faithful children to deeds and lives of heroic virtue and sanctity is unimpaired and active in the Church in our own times as it was long ages ago.

THE LIFE OF ST. LEWIS BERTRAND, FRIAR PREACHER OF THE ORDER OF ST. DOMINIC, AND APOSTLE OF NEW GRENADA. By *Father Bertrand Wilberforce*, of the same Order. London: Burns & Oates. 1882.

The Church is the fruitful mother of Saints. They rise up more numerously and conspicuously in proportion to the violence of the assaults made against her, and the seeming imminence of the dangers that surround her. Thus when, in the sixteenth century, a new epoch commenced in the world's history; when the time of rebellion foretold by the Apostle seemed to have arrived, when the right of private judgment and of free thought concerning revealed truth which afterwards developed into infidelity was openly advocated in Europe, the state almost everywhere triumphed over the Church, country after country was severed from the unity of the Church, its sanctuaries were robbed and desecrated, its shrines pillaged and destroyed, and those who adhered to the old and unchangeable faith were persecuted, it seemed as though resistance to the torrent of rebellion and heresy was of no avail, and that the Church was destined to remain in desolation if not to be destroyed. Yet just then a mighty army of Saints uprose and rallied around the undying Church, their Mother. Some of these, like St. Pius, St. Ignatius, St. Philip, and St. Charles, were destined to stem the torrent of irreligion and heresy in Europe. Others, like St. Francis Xavier, to evangelize heathen countries and to win souls for Christ among remote nations, as a compensation for those lost in Europe. Among these last mentioned was St. Lewis Bertrand, whose biography unfolds one more page of the grand history of the missionary life of the Catholic Church.

The volume before us contains the first Life of St. Lewis Bertrand that has been published in the English language, though in the Spanish catalogue in the British Museum as many as fourteen different biographies of him are mentioned, and there are also a number of French lives of St. Lewis. The reverend author of the work before us has carefully examined these, and also availed himself of other sources of information. Employing these materials he describes the boyhood of the Saint, which in its remarkable signs of virtue, even from tenderest years, was a prophecy of his after-life; the difficulties and delays encountered and finally overcome, that opposed his entrance into the Order of the Friar Preachers; his life as a Novice and as Master of Novices and as Vicar of St. Anne's, his labors in Valencia and their wonderful fruits. The author then follows St. Bertrand to South America, describes the condition both of the European settlers and of the natives, and depicts the heroic labors, self-denial, and self-mortification of St. Lewis, successively in Carthagena, Tubera, Cicafoa, Poluato, St. Martha, and among the Caribbee Indians, and their blessed results.

After seven years of labor, productive of wonderful spiritual fruits in America, St. Lewis found himself constrained to request the General of the Dominican Order to recall him to Spain. His biographer explains the reasons for this step, and then depicts the subsequent life of St. Lewis as Prior of the Convent of St. Onuphrius, as again Master of Novices, as Prior at Valencia, the Christian virtues which shone forth most conspicuously in him, his last illness, his horrible sufferings, heroic patience, and cheerful endurance and fortitude; his intense contrition, profound humility, ardent devotion, and triumphantly peaceful death; the immediate miraculous manifestations of the sanctity of St. Lewis even before his funeral; his funeral and the miraculous manifestations connected with it; his miracles after death; the canonization of St. Lewis and the history of his shrine.

In the course of the author's narrative, and as connected with the

different subjects it comprises, the work furnishes a large amount of valuable and interesting information respecting the condition of Spain and of Spanish America in the sixteenth century, the Mohammedans, Moors, American Indians, and kindred topics.

THE FIRST LINES OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR; being a Brief Abstract of the Author's Larger Work, the "Institutes of English Grammar." Designed for Young Learners. By *Goold Brown*, author of the "Grammar of English Grammars." A New and Revised Edition, arranged to form a Series of Language Lessons, with Exercises in Analysis, Parsing, and Construction. By *Henry Kiddle, A.M.*, late Superintendent of Common Schools, New York City. New York: William Wood & Company.

THE INSTITUTES OF ENGLISH GRAMMAR, Methodically Arranged; with Copious Language Lessons; also, a Key to the Examples of False Syntax. Designed for the Use of Schools, Academies, and Private Students. By *Goold Brown*, author of "The Grammar of English Grammars." A New and Revised Edition, with Exercises in Analysis, Parsing, and Construction. By *Henry Kiddle, A.M.*, late Superintendent of Common Schools, New York City. New York: William Wood & Company.

THE GRAMMAR OF ENGLISH GRAMMARS, with an Introduction, Historical and Critical; the whole Methodically Arranged and amply Illustrated; with Forms of Correcting and Parsing, Improprieties for Correction, Examples for Parsing, Questions for Examination, Exercises for Writing, Observations of Disputed Points, Occasional Strictures and Defences, an Exhibition of the several Methods of Analysis, and a Key to the Oral Exercises. To which are added four Appendixes, pertaining separately to the Four Parts of Grammar. By *Goold Brown*, author of "The Institutes of English Grammar," "The First Lines of English Grammar," etc. Tenth Edition. Revised and Improved. Enlarged by a Copious Index of Matters. By *Samuel U. Berrian, A.M.* New York: William Wood.

The decided merits of Goold Brown's series of English Grammars have long been recognized. Though countless competitors for favor have arisen, from time to time, Goold Brown still retains the high place which years ago he won in the estimation of most competent masters and teachers of English Grammar. The title-pages of the several works which form his complete series of grammars, and which we have given above in full, clearly and distinctly state their respective purposes, and the educational institutions and classes of persons for which they have been severally prepared.

THE WORKS AND WORDS OF OUR SAVIOUR: Gathered from the Four Gospels. By *Henry James Coleridge*, of the Society of Jesus. London: Burns & Oates. 1882.

This book is mainly a republication of the greater part of the masterly work published by Father Coleridge, some years ago, under the title of "The Life of our Life." The Harmony of the Gospels, which that work contained, is omitted, and its narrative and explanatory chapters, together with a considerable amount of new matter, have thus been comprised in a single volume. It would not be easy to speak too highly of the merits of this truly admirable work.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

THE MYSTERY SOLVED; Or, The Prophetic History of the Church. By the *Rev. M. J. Griffith*, Pastor of St. John's Church, Valatie, N. Y. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1882.

CONFERENCES ON THE BLESSED TRINITY. By the *Rev. Dr. J. J. O'Connell, O.S.B.*, St. Mary's College, Gaston County, N. C. New York: The Catholic Publication Society. 1882.

PERIODICAL

70741

DOES NOT CIRCULATE

THIS BOOK MAY NOT BE
TAKEN FROM THIS ROOM